THE LIVING AGE

CONTENTS

for June, 1934

Articles

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SAAR ..... *Jean Galtier-Boissière and A.-L. Sérurier* 292
THE ARMS INVESTIGATION ..... *The Editor* 303
THE ORIENT IN ARMS
I. JAPAN'S REAL GAME ..... *Karl Figdor* 309
II. WAR IN ARABIA ..... *Dr. Wolfgang von Weisl* 313
BRITISH MISCELLANY
I. INSIDE STORY OF THE VICKERS MEETING ..... *A Shareholder* 326
II. THE NEW ARGOSY 328
III. ONE OF THE BEST ..... *Jan Struther* 330
TROTSKI PRO AND CON
I. INTERVIEWING TROTSKI ..... *C. A. S.* 333
II. BANKRUPT TROTSKI ..... *L. Magyar* 337
THE SOLDIER MOTHER ..... *Vassili Grossman* 341

Departments

THE WORLD OVER 283
PERSONS AND PERSONAGES
PUNDIT NEHRU ..... *Harold Laski* 317
CHARLIE CHAPLIN'S DECLINE ..... *Lorenzo Turrent Rozas* 319
SWITZERLAND'S PRESIDENT ..... *Georg Ruttkay* 323
BOOKS ABROAD 351
TO MY MUSE (*Verse*) ..... *Herbert Palmer* 359
LETTERS AND THE ARTS 360
THE SCIENCES AND SOCIETY 364
CORRESPONDENCE 368
WITH THE ADVISORY COUNCIL 372
COMING EVENTS 374

THE LIVING AGE. Published monthly. Publication office, 10 FERRY STREET, CONCORD, N. H. Editorial and General offices, 253 Broadway, New York City. 50c a copy. $6.00 a year. Canada, $6.50. Foreign, $7.00. Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Concord, N. H.; under the Act of Congress, March 3, 1879. Copyright, 1934, by The Living Age Corporation, New York, New York.

THE LIVING AGE was established by E. Littell, in Boston, Massachusetts, May, 1844. It was first known as LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, succeeding *Littell's Museum of Foreign Literature*, which had been previously published in Philadelphia for more than twenty years. In a prepublication announcement of LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, in 1844, Mr. Littell said: 'The steamship has brought Europe, Asia, and Africa into our neighborhood; and will greatly multiply our connections, as Merchants, Travelers, and Politicians, with all parts of the world: *so that much more than ever, it now becomes every intelligent American to be informed of the condition and changes of foreign countries.*'

Subscribers are requested to send notices of changes of address three weeks before they are to take effect. Failure to send such notices will result in the incorrect forwarding of the next copy and delay in its receipt. Old and new addresses must both be given.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GUIDE POST

WE HAVE no apologies to offer for devoting eleven pages to 'The Truth about the Saar'—as a matter of fact, the article translates only the high points of a fifty-page report covering the most important stretch of territory in Europe today. Four months ago Austria suddenly became front-page news, and we have every reason to believe that the Saar will be the Austria of to-morrow. Jean Galtier-Boissière, editor of the *Crapouillot*, is already familiar to our readers as co-author of 'Europe's Greatest Racket' in our December issue, and he is known to the French public as one of the few honest journalists in Paris. Read what he and M. Sérurier have to say about the Saar, and you will be posted ahead of time on an impending development of international import.

SENATOR NYE'S investigation of the American munitions industry explains why we direct special attention to the article on the Saar. For the past three years THE LIVING AGE has been printing exposure after exposure of the international traffic in arms and has gradually made more and more Americans understand that the arms makers in every country are the most powerful single force that is fomenting war to-day. But, because we have pioneered for so long a time in this field, we do not wish to leave the impression that we regard the arms industry as the sole cause of war. We are throwing our weight for whatever it may be worth into supporting Nye's proposal of a 98 per cent tax on all war-time profits, and we agree with Presidents Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt, all of whom have tried to place an embargo on arms shipments to any country at war. Finally, we add our own suggestion that the private banker be controlled just as rigidly as the private manufacturer of arms, with whom he works hand in glove.

OUR readers may be growing as weary of articles on the war danger in the Far East as they were of armament articles a year ago, but we are continuing to direct attention toward what we regard as the most important part of the world to-day. Karl Figdor foresees an alliance between Russia, America, and England aimed against Japan; for our part we are as unconvinced that England will make common cause with either Russia or the United States as we are that it will oppose Japan—see our opening paragraphs of the 'World Over' on this score. But Herr Figdor's article is important for the emphasis it places on Japan's ambitions in Sin-Kiang.

DURING the past half dozen years, we have reproduced a great deal of material about Arabia, where war has now broken out between Ibn Saud and the Imam Yahya. Dr. Wolfgang von Weisl, who is familiar with that part of the world, maintains that England has been supporting Ibn Saud and that Russia has been encouraging the Yemenites. But if Ibn Saud wins a complete victory, England is likely to turn against him for fear that he may threaten the Iraq oil fields.

LEON TROTSKI'S appearance in France and his projected Fourth International have again made him a character of world importance, and his most bitter critics are not the capitalists, whose overthrow he advocates, but the Communists of the Third International, to which he used to belong. We have therefore reproduced his own criticism of the Third International and his plans for a new organization together with an attack on Trotskiism by

(*Continued on page 376*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LIVING AGE

Founded by E. Littell

In 1844

June, 1934 *Volume 346, Number 4413*

The World Over

IN GERMANY and Japan British foreign policy faces two dilemmas of world-wide magnitude. We have referred more than once to England's sympathy toward Nazi Germany. This is not a hang-over from the 1920's when England occasionally supported Germany, notably during the occupation of the Ruhr, in order to prevent France from dominating Europe. To-day Hitler has won the sympathies of the propertied classes in Great Britain not because they fear France but because they fear the spread of Communism and believe that Hitler is the only bulwark against it in Germany. But, if the British Foreign Office shares their fear, it may find itself committing the country first to a crusade against Russia and then to a tremendous revival of German imperialism. For that reason England has not yet quite decided what attitude to take toward Germany. All that we know is that Mr. Knox is using his position as president of the League of Nations Commission in the Saar to envenom Franco-German relations and prevent France and Germany from dividing Europe between them.

Much the same difficulty confronts England in Japan. The decision to prohibit more than a limited volume of imports from Japan would seem to indicate that the die was already cast and that England will line up, as Karl Figdor suggests elsewhere in this issue, with Russia and the United States in opposing Japanese imperialism. But if England supports Germany against Russia in the West, the same fear of Communism

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would surely lead her to support Japan against Russia in the East. Furthermore, the die-hard Conservatives, who have been gaining ground of late, support precisely such a line. 'The manifest interest of England,' says the *Saturday Review*, 'is to keep on good terms with Japan, without any flapdoodle whatsoever.' On the other hand, if England decides to turn against Germany through fear of German imperialism, she will be likely to turn against Japan as well through fear of Japanese imperialism. At present the National Government is merely giving the textile industry, which used to dominate the almost defunct Liberal Party, a run for its money. The tentative offensive it has opened against Japan may yet prove temporary.

FIVE YEARS AGO the three Little Entente states—Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Yugoslavia—decided to become an economic, as well as a political, unit. Nothing, however, was done until this January, when representatives of the three countries met in Prague to work out a method of increasing their trade with each other. And this is what they discovered:—

FOREIGN TRADE OF RUMANIA

	Imports		Exports	
	1932 %	1933 %	1932 %	1933 %
Trade with the two Little Entente countries..	12.62	10.27	8.34	6.01
Trade with the Danube Basin countries.....	19.74	22.60	20.87	17.04
Trade with Germany.....	23.69	18.94	12.34	10.58
Trade with Italy.....	11.00	10.23	10.64	9.27

FOREIGN TRADE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

	Imports		Exports	
	1932 %	1933 %	1932 %	1933 %
Trade with the two Little Entente countries..	9.67	6.99	9.60	7.16
Trade with the Danube Basin countries	18.01	15.77	27.33	23.07
Trade with Germany.....	26.38	20.76	16.34	17.87
Trade with Italy.....	3.38	4.05	2.64	2.79

FOREIGN TRADE OF YUGOSLAVIA
(First six months only)

	Imports		Exports	
	1932 %	1933 %	1932 %	1933 %
Trade with the two Little Entente countries..	15.14	9.13	16.52	13.33
Trade with the Danube Basin countries	32.24	29.14	39.09	40.56
Trade with Germany.....	18.76	12.80	9.98	13.60
Trade with Italy.....	11.81	16.20	26.19	23.82

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The 'Danube Basin countries' refer to Austria, Hungary, and Bulgaria, and, in the case of Austria, that country alone takes more imports from Rumania and Czechoslovakia than either country sells to the other two members of the Little Entente put together. Nor does there seem to be any possibility that the Little Entente can ever become an economic unit. After the War, Czechoslovakia divided the big estates among 37 per cent of the total population, who are now small farmers and demand protection against agricultural imports from Rumania and Yugoslavia. In like manner, Rumania and Yugoslavia have developed their native industries so that they are as unwilling to take manufactured goods from Czechoslovakia as the Czechoslovaks are to take their farm products. The commanding position that Germany and Austria occupy in the markets of the Little Entente explains why France and Italy fear an Austro-German Anschluss as they do.

OUR EDITORIAL article on the arms investigation makes the point that international bankers habitually connive with the international munitions ring, and Dr. Schacht's latest negotiations with Germany's foreign creditors confirm that contention. Last year Germany's favorable trade balance slowly declined, turned unfavorable in January and February, and showed a slight export surplus again in March. This is not wholly due to the boycott of German goods, it is also caused by the doubling and tripling of German imports of raw materials to be used in the war industries. According to an article by Max Bergner in a new émigré publication, *Europäische Hefte*, Schacht has been trying to persuade Germany's creditors to finance German rearmament, and the country needs three or four billion more marks for raw cotton and various metals. He wants to pay for these imports in scrip similar to that now being used to pay interest on foreign loans. Here is the way the scheme would work:—

> Up to now foreign creditors have financed German exports by accepting scrip, and the plan is for them to take still more. If they want money, how will Germany pay them? Easy enough. They can get all the goods they want, and cheap ones, too, for Hitler's Germany can beat Japan itself. Heavy taxation and low wages have prepared the way for a gigantic dumping campaign that Schacht is now organizing. He will accomplish the same thing as he could with inflation—and perhaps go even further. But the purpose of this dumping will not be to increase German exports. The primary purpose of Japanese dumping is to enable the country to prepare for war, and how much more is this true of Germany. The driving force behind Schacht's policy is Germany's hunger for raw materials, and dumped exports will finance purchases of raw materials abroad. Conceivably, the world will tolerate and participate in this speculation of Schacht's, for it feels that otherwise Germany will be forced to inflate, and thus any international currency stabilization will be made impossible. It also feels that there is no other way of getting Germany to pay back the billions already owed abroad. If Schacht

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saves the world from this danger, it will repay him by financing German armament. It may even happen that the first war loan to Germany will come from an enemy country.

THE SAME LIBERAL *New Statesman and Nation* that praises Ernst Henri's new book, *Hitler over Europe*—see our 'Books Abroad' department—and thus gives implicit endorsement to the alarmist views set forth in the preceding paragraph has a correspondent in Germany who is not yet convinced that Hitler is synonymous with big business. He writes from the spot that unemployment has declined tremendously,—it has been estimated at 2,800,000 as compared with 5,600,000 a year ago,—and he declares that the lot of the small farmer, but not the agricultural laborer, has been improved by increased prices. He refuses to state whether Germany is moving to the Right or to the Left, to war or to peace, but he reports that the conservative forces represented by Dr. Schacht, General Göring, and Dr. Schmitt, the Minister of National Economy, are being ousted by the more radical Goebbels, Ley, and Röhm. Here is the outlook as he sees it:—

> The atmosphere in Germany to-day is strangely reminiscent of the later days of William II, an atmosphere of nervous threats and personal intrigue. There is a funny little outburst of *marinismus*, too, in the new names of old streets that are now appearing as Tirpitz Ufer, Graf Speestrasse, and Skagerakplatz, and this, too, at the expense of Hohenzollern names; books about Germany's old colonies are becoming more conspicuous. Yet it is neither at sea nor even on land that Germany's ambitions find their fullest expression; under cover of air defense (no one knows whence air attack should daily be expected), a tremendous programme of aërial armament is rapidly progressing.
>
> It is idle to deny that National Socialism has deep popular roots, especially among the youths who are busily entering for the government prize competitions and collecting national-welfare money. It is idle to suppose that the Hitler régime can be overthrown in a sensational fashion next week. Yet by playing with the fantasy of war, does not the Third Reich show the very signs of suicidal mania that marked the Reich of William II?

A popular story he relates is worth repeating. A certain Storm Trooper is said to have gone about complaining: 'There's only one thing wrong with our Storm Troop—we have one Nazi in it.'

FINALLY, to present a completely sympathetic interpretation of the new Germany, we turn to the columns of J. Middleton Murry's pseudo-Communist *Adelphi* where Mr. Rolf Gardiner, a British sympathizer of Hitler's, gives this description of the Third Reich:—

> The fundamental achievement of the German Revolution, so far entirely uncomprehended by English critics although shiningly apparent to all thinking Germans, lies in its resuscitation of yeoman, peasant values as opposed to indus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trial, urban, manufacturing values. Instead of the peasants being industrialized as in Soviet Russia, the industrial and urban worker in Germany is to be won for the values of the husbandman. The economic system is to be rebuilt along the lines of the homestead, not of the factory. Darré's *Reichserbhofgesetz*, the first great reform granting security of tenure to all proven yeomen, is indicative of the entire trend. The farm worker's conception of equality is wholly different from that of the factory worker: the one is accustomed to a natural distribution of functions among the members of the farm staff, the other is merely a wage-earner among wage-earners.

The triumph of this all-pervading bias in favor of a rural conception of social reorganization was largely due to the experience and influence of the Youth Movement with its heritage of thirty years' rediscovery of the German soil. That the free German Bünde had to be absorbed in the Hitler organizations was a sad but inevitable consequence of revolution. For a country so starved of unanimity, ruthless measures of this order were necessary. The rank and file of the Bünde accepted them with remarkably good humor. The occasion was so gigantic, they said, that such self-abnegation was wholesome; the willing surrender of their group independence could but ultimately strengthen the validity of their cause. To-day, in the S.A. and S.S., in the Hitler Jugend, in the labor service and in land settlement, the forces and traditions of the Bünde are a quickening ferment. The style of the new Germany is a symbiosis of that of the Youth Movement and of that of the political soldiery of Hitler's movement. Throughout there is a warm-hearted flow of real comradeship utterly unguessed at by this sleepy, cynical England of ours; the relation between leaders and led is not one of despotic bullying and regimentation but of intimate, personal trust. The Third Reich may be encountering its difficulties and committing its blunders, but its tone of voice to anyone living in Germany is not that of the Fascist grandees but of the Socialist comrade among comrades.

BARRING DOMESTIC or European upheavals in the near future, Great Britain will soon be focusing attention on India. Die-hard opposition, led by Winston Churchill and Lord Lloyd, former governor general of Egypt, has split the Conservative Party, and a substantial Tory minority now opposes the National Government's faintly conciliatory policy. The *Saturday Review*, the leading exponent of a strong hand in India, has been making its readers shiver with descriptions of recent riots written from the scene of action by Hamish Blair, or 'The Man on the Spot,' as he signs himself. Here is one episode from southern India:—

For years past the tide of Hinduism has been setting steadily toward a revival of the old and hideous customs that had been practically abolished under British rule. Five or six days ago the festival of the Goddess of Epidemics was being celebrated at a village near Tiruvadi, and the worshipers demanded that the old custom of hook-swinging—a barbarous rite consisting of the suspension of human beings from hooks dug into their flesh—should be performed. This, being contrary to public policy, was prohibited by the subordinate magistrate of Tiruvadi, himself a Hindu.

The prohibition infuriated the crowd, and, as they refused to disperse, the magistrate ordered the police to open fire. The forces of law and order were over-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> powered, the magistrate himself taking refuge in a temple, from which he was ignominiously dragged and beaten to death. Order was eventually restored, after further loss of life, by police reinforcements from Tanjore.

Meanwhile, in the north a Hindu mob killed twenty Mohammedans who were wrongly suspected of having killed a cow. Mr. Blair ruminates as follows:—

> The nearer we come to the time when Ramsay MacDonald's 'pledges,' as we are told, must be fulfilled, the greater will be the danger of both communities' getting out of hand. For two centuries the British raj has kept the peace between them, but the present loosening of our grip is already producing riot, bloodshed, and confusion. What may not be expected to happen when the controlling hand is altogether withdrawn?

But the MacDonald Government is too severe to satisfy Bertrand Russell, who has written a preface to the India League's report, *Condition of India*, which has been banned in India itself. This document describes the economic condition of the country, the police terror, and the prisons. At the moment, Bertrand Russell says, oppression appears to have won. However, 'it cannot but produce a deep hatred, which may have to bide its time but will burst out sooner or later . . . The fine idealism of the Congress movement will be swept away by men who will have learnt from us to believe that the only appeal is to force; in some moment of difficulties elsewhere we shall find ourselves confronted by a movement we shall not be able to repress and we shall lose India with ignominy.'

Britain's eventual loss of India seems to be the one subject on which Mr. Russell and the *Saturday Review* agree.

LAST MONTH we gave some figures showing that Fascism had not protected Italy against the world crisis, and it now appears that under Fascism Italy also enjoyed the same improvement that most other nations did in 1933. The average profits of 261 corporations rose from 7.7 per cent in 1932 to 7.9 per cent; 110 of them increased their profits, 17 decreased their losses, and 17 more converted losses into profits. And just as rising profits for the rich have been accompanied by declining incomes for the less well-to-do in Germany and the United States, so in Italy the poorer classes have suffered. State salaries have suddenly been reduced between 6 and 20 per cent, though a simultaneous effort is being made to lower rents and prices. And like France, which has also had to choose between devaluation and deflation, Italy has taken the latter course. The London *Economist* makes this comment:—

> In making his choice between these alternatives Signor Mussolini has declined to follow those countries, like Great Britain, that have been enabled by abandoning the gold standard to balance their budgets and even to show a surplus. Indeed,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is particularly interesting that Fascist Italy has deliberately adopted the remedy that is everywhere recommended by the rentier class. Not only is there to be no devaluation; but, as in France, the budget is to be balanced wholly by cuts and not at all by increased taxation. One might almost conclude that the greatest achievement of Signor Mussolini's régime is the ease with which it can impose deflations on a disfranchised country. Whether the latest dose of economies will increase that régime's popularity is, of course, another matter.

AT LEAST ONE Communist leader in Spain has learned a lesson from his conservative opponents. During the November elections, the Radicals, Socialists, Anarchists, and Communists put up separate candidates almost everywhere and scattered their votes, whereas the conservative parties forgot their differences and threw all their support to one man in each district. The result was that although the Left-wing parties received many more votes than the parties of the Right, the latter gained a plurality—not a majority—of seats in the Cortes. In the light of that experience, José Balbontin, an outstanding Communist, has resigned from the Party because of its refusal to form an organizational united front with the Socialists, the Anarchists, and the Communist opposition to fight Fascism. In a letter to the Central Committee of the Spanish Communist Party he says:—

I do not believe that Fascism in Spain has been defeated, as Comrade Stalin stated in his last speech. It seems to me that Fascism in Spain marches apace and has one foot in the Government already, and it will soon succeed in monopolizing the Government completely if we do not hurry to stop it by a sincere united front against Fascism. . . .

It seems evident to me that Spanish Socialism and Anarchism want sincerely to fight against the Fascist danger and that in this critical moment the Spanish Communists must join loyally with the Socialists and Anarchists in a united front from below and from above, suspending all internal factional struggles in answer to the demands of the masses.

We must suppress effectively the advances of Fascism, and only then shall we be able, without fear, to dedicate ourselves to the tasks of organizing a workers' and peasants' government based on soviets.

At this moment in Spain, it seems to me premature to insist on imposing upon the great revolutionary mass the leadership of a Communist Party, which has hardly begun to sprout. If you insist on an immediate displacement of Socialist and Anarchist leadership, in place of treating with them provisionally, you are preventing a proletarian block and you are facilitating the complete triumph of Fascism, just as was done in Germany.

IN OUR 'Persons and Personages' department, the President of Switzerland assures the world that his country will remain true to the gold standard, but his confidence somehow gives the impression that he has something to conceal. And he has. For the danger to the Swiss franc does not lie in an inadequate gold reserve but in a declining volume of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exports and in diminishing receipts from foreign investments. Swiss exports have fallen by two thirds since 1929, interest on foreign investments has been cut in two, and the purchasing power of the Swiss people has diminished accordingly. Meanwhile the total indebtedness of the Swiss State has risen to more than 7 billion francs,—about 2½ billion dollars at the current rate of exchange,—and the private indebtedness of agriculture amounts to 4.8 billion francs. Heavy industry is wrecked and lives on government subsidies. The situation thus begins to parallel that of the United States a year ago, for the independent peasants, like our own farmers, are steadily losing their land and are turning from Republicanism to Socialism. The Radical—that is, the Republican—Party has been in power for 86 years, and the Socialists are the only opposition group. They are demanding planned economy and a controlled currency and may be able to form a block with the Agrarians if they can win the peasants away from the Radicals. In that event, the Swiss franc will be sacrificed.

THE HARBIN CORRESPONDENT of the *China Weekly Review* has undertaken a cool appraisal of the chances of war between Japan and Russia and finds that it has not yet occurred for these four reasons. First, the Japanese have not yet consolidated their position in Manchuria where banditry is still as prevalent as ever. Second, Japan has only just completed three strategic railways—the Kirin-Kwainei, the Laha-Harbin, and the Koshan-Hailung lines. Third, Japan has no foreign ally with the possible exception of Germany. Fourth, the White Russians in Manchuria must be organized to support Japan, and efforts in this quarter have been going forward for the past eight months. Granting that Japan has not been ready to fight until the present moment, when will she strike? Either in the spring or summer, and within the next year. Russia has not quite completed double-tracking the Transsiberian railway and is employing 'class enemies' on that task. This, according to the *China Weekly Review's* correspondent, is a bad mistake because the Japanese will attempt not only to cut the railway line but to set the men who have been working on it against the Russians. The prophecy is also made that Japan will spring a surprise attack against the Soviet air bases in the vicinity of Vladivostok without any declaration of war. But this correspondent doubts that the Japanese will succeed: they must move by 1935, and even by that time the Transsiberian may be double-tracked. One factor that has prevented them from acting sooner is the continued and unexpected resistance put up by the Manchurian bandits who may unconsciously have saved the Soviet Union.

THE CONDITION of the Japanese people beggars description, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

here are some significant facts. Wages in big establishments have declined 40 per cent since 1926, and since 1933 the Nippon Steel Works has reduced wages between 22 per cent and 40 per cent. Intensity of labor, however, has increased: women spinners now tend 60 spindles a day instead of 30 as in 1922, and in the chemical industry they receive one yen for a fifteen-hour day. Over three million workers have no jobs, and more than two million of them are destitute on the streets, for there is no unemployment relief. The value of the armament shares, however, increased fourfold between 1931 and 1933. And the peasants have as hard a time as the city workers. Even if the 5,000,000 acres of uncultivated land were made productive, there would be about half an acre of cultivated land per capita, and it is figured that Japanese agriculture can thrive only if there is an acre and a quarter of arable land per capita, the figure for Denmark being an acre and three quarters. The chief hope of the Japanese farmer at the present time lies in small factories, of which there are now over 11,000. Of these 226 are operated by the municipalities, 1,471 by coöperatives, 502 by agricultural societies, 7,531 by partnership organizations, and 1,296 by others.

ORIENTAL TRADE has undergone three great changes in the past few years. The Chinese boycott of Japanese goods and Japan's conquest of Manchuria have diverted Japanese exports from China to the new state of Manchukuo; China's trade balance has become increasingly unfavorable; and China has begun to buy more capital goods at a time when she is purchasing fewer finished products. Japanese exports to Manchukuo rose from 9,633,000 yen in 1930 to 61,336,000 yen in 1933, but Japanese exports of cotton goods to China fell from $144,556,000 (silver) in 1930 to $57,295,000 in 1932, whereas England's share of exports increased during the same period, even in the face of a general decline. Indeed, this decline of Chinese imports went so far that the usual import surplus of silver became an export surplus, and China was compelled for the first time in many years to pay for some of her imports in silver, although the buying power of that metal was declining rapidly. Yet, in spite of the disadvantage of paying exorbitant prices in terms of silver, China increased her imports of machinery and machine tools. The British Department of Overseas Trade has summed up the situation as follows:—

> Industrial expansion in China must continue. The greatest market in China from now forward will undoubtedly consist mainly of capital goods, and the loss in consumable goods will, or can be, much more than offset by the volume of machinery and equipment we supply.

How long it will take to make China industrially self-sufficient the Department of Overseas Trade does not say.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two independent French journalists expose the conspiracy of their big industrialists to retain control of the Saar or fight Germany in the attempt.

The TRUTH *about the* Saar

By JEAN GALTIER-BOISSIÈRE AND A.-L. SÉRURIER

Translated from *Crapouillot*
Paris Topical Monthly

A LORRAINE river, the Saar, runs from the Vosges to the Moselle, which it joins in the Prussian Rhineland after emerging from a narrow region that bears its name, a little mountainous, wooded, moist, unfertile, sad country, yet one of the most thickly settled in Europe, with its eight hundred thousand German-speaking inhabitants. Before the War, thirteen million tons of soft coal were extracted from this waste land every year.

The wealth of the country lies in its coal mines and heavy industry. Huge reserves of coal go to the factories, the steel mills, and a vast powerful series of heavy industries that are owned by a few individuals, for the Saar is surrounded by coke ovens, iron mills, factories, transformation industries, brick fields, glass factories, crockery factories, and innumerable manufacturing plants. The Saar lives on its subterranean wealth. It pours forth coal but has no wheat. Of eight hundred thousand inhabitants less than five thousand cultivate the soil. Of the nine railroads that run eastward into Germany from France, six pass through the Saar, and at Saarbrücken, the capital, the lines from Paris to Mayence and from Strassburg to Cologne meet.

The entire Saar was French between the years 1680 and 1697, a total of seventeen years, and did not return to France again until 1792, when it remained in French hands until 1815, a total of twenty-two years. It then remained German from 1815 to 1918, a hundred and three years in succession. When the Great War broke out, the question of Alsace-Lorraine was immediately raised, but nobody made any allusions to the Saar, for it had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not been French since 1815. Nevertheless, in October, 1915, Robert Pinot, Royalist and secretary general of the Comité des Forges, demanded the annexation of the Saar and showed that without the Saar the return of Alsace-Lorraine would produce the most serious industrial crisis in France, since our two provinces consume 18 million tons of coal a year and only produce 4 million tons. In 1917 the convention of metallurgical industries in Lyon, presided over by Théodore Laurent, director general of the Aciéries de la Marine et d'Homécourt, laid down two points for the future peace treaty: one, the annexation of the Saar basin, two, the provision of French industry with a definite amount of soft coal for as long a period as possible. This date marked the beginning of a campaign to gain the left bank of the Rhine, a campaign that was launched in many newspapers that take their orders from the masters of heavy industry.

In 1919, the Anglo-Saxon delegates at Versailles who were advocating the right of peoples to self-determination vetoed the annexation of the Saar although they did not oppose the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France without a plebiscite. But the Lorraine frontier of 1815, as laid down in the Versailles Treaty, cut the Saar basin in two and left France the poorer half of that territory. The big French industrialists therefore again began demanding the return of the entire Saar basin to France on the ground that the territory had been French from the time of the French Revolution to 1815. Lloyd George declared that there would be danger of creating a new Alsace-Lorraine by taking away from Germany a territory that had become German again for over a century. Clémenceau then asked that France should own the mines, and Lloyd George was disposed to agree though he would not permit French sovereignty over the Saar. Wilson, however, refused both propositions and declared that France had never asked for the 1814 frontier in any public document. The American president finally recognized the right of France to use the Saar mines by way of reparation for her own mines in the north that had been damaged during the War.

The government of the Saar was therefore handed over to a commission of five members named by the Council of the League of Nations, one Frenchman, one representative of the Saar, and three representatives of any three other countries except France or Germany. This commission, representing the League of Nations, was given all the powers of government. Under its control the inhabitants preserved their local assemblies, their schools, and language, and they were allowed to leave the territory if they desired to do so. There was no military obligation, and the French tariff régime prevailed. French money circulates freely in the Saar.

After fifteen years of this provisional régime every man and woman over twenty-one years old who was living in this territory when the peace treaty was signed will vote by communes, or districts, on the following three points: maintenance of the régime established by the Versailles Treaty, union with France, union with Germany. The League of Nations will then decide on the basis of this vote under what sovereignty the Saar will be placed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If after the plebiscite all, or part, of the Saar returns to Germany, that country will repurchase in gold all the property rights of France in the local mines. In the event of non-payment at the end of a year, the Commission of Reparations will, if necessary, liquidate whatever mines are involved. In any case, the French state and French citizens will have the right to buy all the coal they need after Germany has repurchased all or some of the mines. These stipulations occur in paragraphs 36 and 37 of the treaty, which therefore allows for a possible division of the Saar territory and provides for various transactions in that event. It also provides for the liquidation of the mines in case of non-payment by Germany. Moreover, paragraph 38 expressly states that 'it is understood that France and Germany will be able, by separate agreements reached before the date fixed for payment of the repurchase price, to destroy paragraphs 36 and 37.'

During the first years of peace England, and especially English economists, cast dark looks in our direction. We were upholding the claims of the Poles in Upper Silesia. France was providing soft coal to all comers, and England's monopoly was being threatened at a time when the English thought that they were permanently established because of the defeat of the Germans. England was not inclined to allow us both the Saar and the Ruhr. Moreover, French heavy industry was developing rapidly after the War, and the Saar could not fail to add to its power. In 1924 France was competing with British heavy industry on the British market. Soft coal from the Saar was penetrating Italy and Switzerland and driving out English coal. But the big French industrialists, eager to pacify the English who purchased many of their metallurgical products and from whom they bought most of their anthracite, thought it wise to pass over the very delicate question of the Saar and also decided to evacuate the Ruhr. In 1928, however, a change occurred. German industry had undergone an extraordinary revival. It again appeared with formidable power, and the English did not fail to understand the strength of their new rival, which had so lately been paralyzed. This was the moment to remind England that the Saar might very well be kept out of German hands.

II

French policy in the Saar has two interests to consider: first, the French Government, which owns the mines and controls the French members of the Commission, whose task is to defend French interests in general, both political and economic, and second, a group of individuals who own important rights in the iron works of the Saar.

By 1929, after the military occupation and ten years of civilian control, popular sentiment in the Saar had not changed. Opinion still favored unconditional union with Germany. The inhabitants did not want to be governed by Canadians, Belgians, or Finns any longer. They wished to recover their full political rights, to feel that they were protected by the parliament of a Great Power and represented in it. They placed the idea of returning to their German fatherland above the satisfaction of their material interests.

Between 1925 and 1929 French

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy was definitely directed toward a Franco-German rapprochement, and the problem of the Saar became the order of the day. Gustav Stresemann had raised the question at Thoiry in 1926 and at San Remo in 1927, and he discussed it again with Briand at the first Hague conference in August, 1929. On August 31, the final agreement to end the Rhineland occupation was reached, but the question of the Saar remained unsolved. Stresemann and Briand exchanged letters and decided to begin official negotiations on September 27, 1929.

These negotiations regarded the return of the Saar to German sovereignty as a concession on the part of France. The rights of the Saar population to self-determination were to remain safeguarded, for the possibility was still left open for a plebiscite in 1935 that would give the people of the Saar a chance to approve or disapprove of the friendly agreement between France and Germany. In return for the political concessions of France, the Germans offered favorable grants to our economic interests. There is no doubt that these concessions would have been granted if the Germans could have obtained satisfaction in a matter that remains for them now, as ever, one of national interest. The mines would have been repurchased and paid for by Germany, which then had much more gold than it has to-day.

But on October 22, 1929, the Briand Government fell and was replaced by a Tardieu Ministry, completely made up of men opposed to the policy of Franco-German understanding, and although Briand remained Minister of Foreign Affairs he was isolated and encircled. Tardieu assumed power on November 7, 1929; Franco-German understanding and the settlement of the one problem that was the touchstone of that policy became impossible. The French delegation up to that time had been headed by Arthur Fontaine, president of the board of directors of the Saar mines, president of the International Labor Bureau, and a remarkable character completely devoted to the idea of Franco-German rapprochement. Arthur Fontaine was replaced in the presidency by M. Pernot, Minister of Public Works, one of the sixty-three deputies who had voted against the Locarno agreements. M. Pernot placed at the head of his demands not the repurchase of the mines by Germany at a good price but the division of the mines and their partition among French and German capitalists. The German delegation flatly turned down this new suggestion on the ground of principle. From this point on there was no need of trying to torpedo the negotiations, since all proposals prevented the return of the Saar mines to Prussian or Bavarian hands and were therefore rejected without discussion by the Germans for historical, political, and social reasons.

While the French masters of the mines were grouping themselves for economic action, they also founded the French Association of the Saar to enable them to act with equal success in the political field. The president of this association was Henri Rossignol, and he was not slow about getting into action. The association began a press campaign in *Figaro*, *l'Ami du Peuple*, *le Capital*, *l'Action Française*, *l'Animateur des Temps Nouveaux*, and *le Lorrain*, published in Metz. It released magazine articles, pamphlets,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and books. Many meetings were held by the French Association of the Saar, by the French Metallurgical Association, headed by M. François-Poncet, and by the Union of Commerce and Industry.

At the same time, the French industrialists enrolled a certain number of politicians to lead a campaign in behalf of their special interests. All these convergent activities that tended to sabotage the negotiations came to a head in a debate in the Chamber when the Tardieu Cabinet presented itself—November 7 and 8, 1929. Briand was questioned by Franklin-Bouillon on the 7th and by Taittinger and Georges Bureau on the 8th.

Briand replied, 'I have heard it stated from this tribune that by the terms of the Versailles Treaty we are the proprietors of the mines, which is true, and that we need only remain in the Saar five years more, at the end of which time we can sell the mines at any price we want, so that if their value increases we should profit by waiting. This is not true. At the end of five years, if the plebiscite is unfavorable, we must depart and must sell our mines not at the price we fix but at a price fixed by arbitrators in accordance with provisions already laid down in the treaty.'

The Minister of Foreign Affairs could not explain publicly in the presence of the German Ambassador numerous reasons why it would be to the interest of France to liquidate the Saar without waiting for the plebiscite, for then he would have revealed the cards he held. It was therefore difficult to justify his clever policy, and his adversaries took advantage of this fact. The result was that on June 30, 1930, the two delegations separated without reaching any result. The negotiations that might have led not only to agreement but to real peace between France and Germany had been magnificently torpedoed.

III

The German Government has always had a great many individuals and groups to advance its cause and make propaganda in the Saar. These include the chief newspapers, the clergy, the trade unions and their leaders, the political parties and their leaders, the deputies in the local parliament, the local industrialists, the local business men and all their economic satellites. These elements were directed by Berlin and received orders from the capital. There are offices and services in Berlin devoted to the Saar question, and such lofty Berlin functionaries as von Schubert and von Friedberg have always been in charge of united action.

For a long time there was no similar service or office in Paris charged with the Saar question as a whole, and no individual directed the manœuvres. But when a service was finally established, it made the most scandalous 'breaks' in its choice of agents, who included the president of the Socialist Party in the Saar, Max Waltz, a man with a very poor reputation, who was honored by being presented to Paul-Boncour, French Minister of Foreign Affairs. The most ridiculous chapter in this story occurred on October 21, 1933, six days after the presentation. The office of the Saar Socialist Party, of which Waltz was president, addressed to all party members a circular declaring that Waltz had been expelled and accusing him of having used al-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most all the party funds to demolish his personal enemies. The document containing these grave accusations was published on October 28, 1933, by the Hitlerite newspapers.

After the negotiations of 1929–30 had been sabotaged, complete inertia fell upon the French. The masters of the iron works rested on their laurels, but unfortunately their victory did not bring them the results they expected, since the world crisis began at just that time. The German market, to which the Saar sent half its products, collapsed. Production was reduced to one-third or one-half of normal, and huge profits turned into huge losses. From the German side propaganda continued methodically and consolidated previous gains. The situation at the end of 1932 was revealed at the communal elections in November of that year. Of 4,301 municipal councilors elected, only seven were favorable to the *status quo*. At this time all the political parties in the Saar from the Nationalists to the Communists demanded pure and simple return to the German fatherland.

But Hitler's seizure of power provoked real confusion in public opinion and in the conduct of the various parties in the Saar. At the time of the Neunkirchen catastrophe in February, 1933, von Papen, who came from the Saar, where he is a property owner, and Seldte, leader of the Steel Helmets, represented the German Government at the obsequies of the victims. After the ceremony they invited the press of the Saar to meet them, but the Catholic and Socialist newspapers declined. Certain French propagandists then reached the conclusion that the Centre Party, which has the support of about half the population, and the Social-Democratic Party were definitely breaking away from the Reich, and therefore a press campaign in behalf of the French Association of the Saar began. The Catholic and Socialist newspapers of the Saar, not being subject to Hitler's coercion, found that they were the only mouthpieces of the former German Centre and Socialist Parties. And they took advantage of their liberty, thus confirming the opinions of the French Association of the Saar. The German Government therefore decided to take vigorous action in Germany against the Centre and Socialist Parties.

The Catholic press in the Saar offered hardly any resistance, and its submission was rapid and complete. Its organ, the *Landeszeitung*, of March 28, 1933, contained a sensational declaration in behalf of a return to Germany. The attacks on Hitler disappeared and were soon replaced by eulogies of the new régime of the Führer.

The Socialist Party of the Saar did not submit so quickly, nor did its organ, the *Volksstimme*. Nevertheless, Max Braun, leader of the Saar Socialists, published in his own name and in behalf of the party committee a declaration on April 8, 1933, taking the same line that the Centre Party had. He declared that the Social-Democratic Party would demand in the future, as it had in the past, integral return of the Saar to Germany. Max Braun's declaration of loyalty did not prevent Hitler from treating him as a traitor to the country. This attitude explains why Braun slowly and prudently began to favor a continuation of the present régime in the Saar, hoping not to lose all his sup-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

porters who are Germans first and Marxists afterward.

But when he launched a new newspaper in the hope of recapturing the position that *Vorwärts*, the defunct organ of the Socialist Party, used to hold, he gradually lost his adherents. The Left-wing Socialists passed over to the Communists, and the Right wing joined the United German Front that had swallowed the former Nationalist, Populist, and Centrist Parties. On August 27, 1933, when eighty thousand Germans demonstrated at Niederwald in behalf of the loyalty of the Saar to the Reich, Max Braun assembled only 3,500 followers at Neunkirchen and openly advised them to vote for the *status quo*. Max Braun called himself leader of the Saar anti-Fascist front and not leader of the autonomous, or separatist, front. The difference is significant. Moreover, he himself does not come from the Saar and cannot vote there. He emigrated from the Rhineland in 1923.

On July 14, 1933, all the parties in the Saar except the Marxists had joined the German front. But the hesitation that the Catholics had shown and the split in the Socialist Party led the French Association of the Saar to hope that the plebiscite might favor the *status quo*. The Association, which up to then had confined most of its efforts to the French inhabitants, thought that the time had come to appeal to the natives as well with active propaganda among elements that were known to be anti-Hitlerites, Marxists, or autonomists and with a general attack on the Nazis and the German front. The aid of the governing Commission in the Saar and of the French Government seemed indispensable. The job of exposing a Hitlerite terror in the Saar was therefore entrusted to Max Braun and Max Waltz, leader of the Saar League for the Rights of Man, chiefly recruited from German refugees and Jews in the Saar and bearing no relationship with the French League for the Rights of Man.

Max Braun began a newspaper campaign in his *Volksstimme*, and the autonomous newspapers supported him. Max Waltz published a memorandum in French, enumerating all the acts of Nazi terrorism in the Saar, whereupon Mr. Knox, the English president of the Saar Commission of government, issued an edict in the name of his Commission and laid down seven very severe ordinances to check the Nazi terror and paralyze Hitlerite propaganda. As a result of these ordinances, all political liberty was suppressed in the Saar, and a virtual state of siege resulted.

Beginning on October 1, 1933, the bourgeois parties announced their dissolution one after another, first the National German Party, then the People's Party, then the bourgeois Centre Party, and, finally, the Catholic Centre Party. Only the National-Socialist Party remained and thus played the chief rôle in forming the German front. Thus the German front had the support of about eighty per cent of the population who are entitled to vote in the plebiscite.

The German front had made terrifying progress within a short time, and this made the Saar Commission anxious. Workers, business men, and intellectuals were all joining a national movement against which it was very difficult to struggle. The police, the courts, the public administrators, including the highest functionaries, had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been won over. The local parliament and the newspapers were constantly protesting against the humiliating restrictions that the Commission had imposed on national sentiment in the Saar. By the beginning of 1934, the Saar Commission clearly saw that it might not be able to govern the country any longer because of the animosity of the population. The natives naturally held France responsible for most of the autocratic measures that the Commission had taken. France was accused every day of planning to fix the plebiscite and take the Saar by force. The relations between the French and the natives became more and more tense.

The masters of the Saar iron works hoped to bring about a favorable plebiscite first by propaganda and then by pressure, if necessary. But now the most optimistic began to lose confidence and had their Social-Democratic spokesman, Max Braun, ask for a postponement of the plebiscite for five years, or at least for two years, under the pretext that Nazi pressure in the Saar would affect the voting. But the hope of a postponement received a severe jolt in January, 1934, when the League of Nations announced its decision to fulfill all its duties for the execution of the plebiscite in 1935.

IV

It is no exaggeration to use the word 'conspiracy' to describe the activities of very diverse people who are grouped together to defend their own profits and who, caring nothing for the general interests of France, have thought only of torpedoing every effort to conciliate the French and German Governments on the subject of the Saar, to mislead French opinion by censored reports and false information, and, finally, to encourage agitation that could produce only the most disastrous consequences. At the head of these conspirators we find one of the magnates of the Comité des Forges, the chief rival of Schneider and de Wendel, M. Théodore Laurent. The scandalous rôle that he played with the aid of Alexandre Millerand in securing certain property in Lorraine is already known. Vice president of the Comité des Forges of the Saar, 'Théodore,' as his friends and enemies in big industry call him, has properties at Dillingen in the Société Redange-Dilling and at Saint-Ingbert in the 'Hadir,' as it is called for short. He is a man with an iron will and a prodigious capacity for work and is the leader of the conspiracy. His chief lieutenant is M. Arthur Bommelaer, a director of the Société Alsacienne de Constructions Mécaniques, which owns an important factory in Belfort and employs certain electoral agents of M. André Tardieu's who cannot refuse his friend Bommelaer anything, since Bommelaer is the director of various industries and vice president of the Comité des Forges of the Saar and founder of the French Association of the Saar.

The president of the 'economic group of French with capital in the Saar' was originally a man named Maugas, a naval inspector and a director of Hadir. That post is now held by Léon Daum, nephew by marriage of Poincaré and chairman of the board of directors of the Aciéries de la Marine et d'Homécourt, of which Laurent is the president.

The honorable president of the French Association of the Saar is Jacques Bardoux, a member of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Institut and a publicist connected with the Comité des Forges. The president of the Association is Henri Rossignol, who declared in his first speech in 1928, when he accepted the presidency, that he would make it a condition that he could not put himself in the service of any personal or private interests. It is this same Rossignol, an insurance agent and a notorious figure in various scandals, who was just forced to resign from the presidency of the National Union of Combatants after having admitted that he had received from Stavisky a check for 100,000 francs: 'Received from M. Alexandre, the sum of 100,000 francs on account, in accord with the agreement dated to-day. Paris, May 6, 1933. Henri Rossignol.'

The members of the Association include such convinced patriots as Gaston Doumergue, Generals Mordacq and Le Rond, Deputy Oberkirch, Senators Maurice Ordinaire and Eccard. The propagandists of the Association include Henri Lanrezac, son of the general, and the publicist, Robert Herly, who signs himself Revire. Lanrezac receives a military pension and an important share of the profits of the Saar mines. He was engaged as financial comptroller through the intervention, it appears, of André Tardieu. No doubt his control permits him a few moments of leisure, for, under the pseudonym of De Cazernal, he is the editor-in-chief of the *Journal des Français de la Saar* and correspondent of the *Moniteur du Calvados*.

Apropos of Cazernal and Herly, Deputy Henri Guernut wrote in the *Cahiers des Droits de l'Homme* in 1929: 'It is rather singular that the administration of the Mines Domaniales de la Sarre, an organic part of the French State, has procured for these two publicists places in which it is notoriously well known that they have no services to perform, thus putting them at the complete disposal of a propaganda campaign opposed to the policy of the French Government, which, of course, can find no support in any French member of the governing Commission.'

The magnates of the Saar naturally have their spokesmen in parliament, and these include, besides Messrs. Ordinaire and Eccard, ex-President Millerand, M. Doeblé, former secretary of a Communist trade union, originally elected as a Communist and then reëlected as a 'Left Independent,' and Messrs. Wallach, Marin, Pernot, Fribourg, and Tardieu. These men are in constant touch with the conspirators Théodore Laurent, Bommelaer, and the two Socialist leaders in the Saar, Max Braun and Max Waltz, for it is not the least piquant element in this plot to find distinguished representatives of French capitalism subsidizing Marxist parties in the Saar.

The conspirators take care not to announce their aims too cynically, and their appointed scribes do not fail to put forward great principles and noble ideals in accordance with the same formula that was used to perfection by the war profiteers. These conspirators declare that France must remain in the Saar at all costs for these reasons: first, to preserve French prestige; second, to continue the expansion of France in accordance with the traditional policy of French royalty and Napoleon; third, to perpetuate the republican tradition by defending republican liberty against Hitlerism; fourth, to prevent a new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

German invasion; fifth, to prevent the ruin of French business with the Saar; sixth, to avoid handing over to the Germans mines that are the property of the French State; seventh, to prevent the collapse of prosperity in the Saar, which would be its fate if it returned to Germany; eighth, not to deprive France of certain metallurgical products; and ninth, not to lose the markets for French products that the Saar factories provide.

V

Two years ago, when the new president of the governing Commission, Mr. Knox, arrived in the Saar, he tried to establish closer connections with the population and its leaders than his predecessor, another Englishman, had done. But he must have soon seen that such a relationship was practically impossible. The people of the Saar regard the governing Commission as an organ imposed upon them, which governs autocratically against the wishes of the local parliament. They call the Commission the *Negerregierung*, government for Negroes, or the *Kolonialsystem*. Nevertheless, Mr. Knox did not confine himself, as his predecessor had done, to a correct cold administrative rôle. When Hitler came into power and Nazi propaganda began to provoke lively reaction in different parties, Knox, as an Englishman and a democrat, had no sympathy for the Hitler régime. The danger seemed immediate, and he at once took grave measures that disturbed local opinion. The population saw in him the determined adversary of the German cause in the Saar. The press blamed him for everything that happened, although the masters of the iron works were responsible for the activity of the autonomists. The latter congratulated themselves on Knox's actions. They had never dared to hope for so much, and Jean Revire glorified this 'counter-offensive of legality.'

At the January, 1934, session of the League of Nations, Mr. Knox explained the situation before the Council and described it as being very grave. He wished to justify the Draconian régime that he had instituted in the Saar. The representatives of France showed prudent reserve. Had not Paul-Boncour declared that the maintenance of order in the Saar was the duty of the League of Nations and not of France? But Sir John Simon did not conceal his disapproval. His profuse declarations made a sensation. Yet when Mr. Knox returned to the Saar he did not modify his policy and began censoring the newspapers more than ever.

There is food for thought here. Is it possible that Mr. Knox, a career diplomat and one of the best in the Foreign Office, should have compromised his career and not acted in complete accord with the British Government, and is it possible that an English diplomat should really be disavowed by his government? That would be something unprecedented in British diplomacy. One can well ask, as some suspicious Frenchmen do, whether the truth is not something quite different. In the Saar England has put her finger on an essentially tender spot in Franco-German relations. It is one of the easiest places to envenom these relationships, and has not that always been England's continental policy?

Of course, the British Government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had to put up some kind of official defense, and Sir John Simon did his part loyally. But didn't Mr. Knox go even beyond the expressed desires of the French conspirators, some of whom were said to want to curb his activities? It was rather naïve of these conspirators to believe that an English diplomat had let himself be manœuvred. From the British point of view there are neither German nor French interests to defend or combat in the Saar or anywhere else. There are English interests and no others.

The subsidized press campaigns have not obscured the judgment of the average Frenchman so much that he cannot understand a simple elementary appeal to his common sense. Savoy was added to France in 1860, and it has remained French for seventy-four years. In 1918 the Saar had been German for a hundred and three. Let us suppose that after the War Savoy—which certain Fascists claim along with Nice, Corsica, and Tunis—had to choose between France and Italy. Would not the French treat the people of Annecy or Ugines as traitors if they were to demand an independent Savoy? Would not the *Action Française* and the *Écho de Paris* use the same language that the pan-German newspapers use to stigmatize the autonomists in the Saar?

Of course, the strictly material interests of the people in the Saar should urge them to vote against the return to Germany, for they have enjoyed an absolutely exceptional régime. 'If the Saar ever becomes German again,' Hugo Stinnes declared, 'its products would have to be sent to the scrap yard.' When the people of the Saar become German, they will have heavier taxes because they will pay taxes for the Reich instead of merely for themselves. They will have less business and more military laws. Every consideration of material well-being should incline them to refuse to join Germany, but, like the wife of the *Médecin malgré lui* who preferred to be beaten, the people of the Saar place their national sentiments above their own interests. To change the result of the plebiscite would require a 'kind of miracle,' according to Charles Drouart, the very active president of Franco-Saar Chamber of Commerce.

The people of the Saar have never known the real face of France. They have seen only scandal-mongers and profiteers. In the present state of tension the responsibility of certain magnates is appalling. They have not hesitated to foment sterile agitations concerning the results of which they have no illusions. These activities in no way further the real policy of France, and they risk, as our engineers in the Saar unanimously declare, serious trouble. But does not Théodore Laurent, who has tried with his subsidized press to infuse the spirit of France in the Saar and to make a new Alsace-Lorraine, fear the terrible consequences of his own private policy, which may degenerate to-morrow into bloody conflict? Not at all. Isn't M. Théodore Laurent himself a cannon merchant?

If France and Germany should ever be able to get together in the economic field, the settlement of the Saar problem might be the first step, the precursor to future Franco-German agreements, the first move toward a European customs union that might be able to save the continent from misery and war.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first American editor to undertake a systematic exposure of the munitions ring abroad offers some suggestions to Senator Nye's investigators over here.

The ARMS Investigation

By THE EDITOR OF THE LIVING AGE

THREE years ago THE LIVING AGE reproduced its first armament exposé—'Corruption in Armaments' by Francis Delaisi. A year later came the 'Secret International' and 'Steel against Peace.' Last fall we gave our readers the 'Man Behind Hitler,' 'Germany Mobilizes,' 'War Pays,' and 'Europe's Greatest Racket.' Early in March Senator Borah read extracts from our October 1932 issue into the *Congressional Record*, and Senator Nye's investigation of the munitions industry was approved shortly afterward. The Book-of-the-Month Club picked *Merchants of Death* as its May selection, and George Seldes's *Iron, Blood and Profits* appeared simultaneously. Here is an unsolicited letter from Mr. F. C. Hanighen, co-author of *Merchants of Death*, addressed to the Editor of THE LIVING AGE and describing the part this magazine has played in exposing the munitions racket here and abroad:—

'Now that the Book-of-the-Month Club has taken our book, *Merchants of Death*, and we have had such remarkable success with it, I would like to acknowledge my debt to you and THE LIVING AGE. I should remind you that you were the first to suggest to me that such a book be written, and the materials on the subject from back numbers of THE LIVING AGE, which you placed at my disposal, were invaluable to me in getting started. Subsequently I met Mr. Engelbrecht, who had been exploring the armament question himself, and we entered into collaboration.

'In the past year a number of magazines in this country have published articles on the subject, and one at least had wide publicity. I have long noticed that most of the exposés and sensational stories about international affairs appearing in American periodicals have been "broken" long before in your columns. Therefore, it seems to me only just to say that what is news to-day in this field has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

familiar to readers of THE LIVING AGE for several years. More power to you in the excellent work you are doing.

Sincerely,

Frank C. Hanighen'

Mr. Hanighen's letter and the record on which it is based therefore encourage us to go a step further and to suggest in the light of foreign experience how the Nye Committee might investigate 'the activities of individuals, firms, corporations, and all other agencies in the United States engaged in the manufacture, sale, distribution, import, or export of arms, munitions, and other implements of war.' And if we again succeed in anticipating the course of events and furthering a cause that we have championed for years, so much the better.

A brief outline of the armament industry abroad may help to emphasize what Senator Nye will be looking for in the United States. We know, for instance, that the arms makers of Europe had formed their 'Secret International' long before 1914 and that throughout the World War French aluminum and German magnetos traveled between the two countries by way of Switzerland. Allied artillery never shelled the Briey Basin, which lay just behind the German lines and contained iron deposits essential to the German armament industry, and British coal and ore continually passed through Sweden, Norway, and Denmark to Germany. These revelations and many others have never been denied and offer conclusive proof that, even at the height of the most destructive war in history, armament makers did an international business with friend and foe alike.

But in the not-so-piping times of peace, armament sales declined, and in 1927 the European arms industry faced a crisis: Marshal Foch declared that Germany had been completely disarmed. At once the loose confederation of big French industrialists known as the Comité des Forges and dominated by the armament firm of Schneider-Creusot got busy. Newspapers, magazines, and publicists owned or subsidized by the Comité launched a series of campaigns exposing Germany's alleged military preparations, and by 1929 France was spending twice as much on defense as she had before the War. And to give this campaign some basis of reality money flowed from the Comité des Forges to Hitler via its Skoda subsidiary in Czechoslovakia.

By February, 1932, when the Disarmament Conference opened in Geneva to the tune of the Shanghai bombardment, the 'Secret International' had carried the day. The Comité des Forges had purchased an interest in the *Temps* and had thus established itself as the mouthpiece of the French Foreign Office. President Doumer and his successor, President Lebrun, were both former employees of the Comité des Forges; so are André Tardieu and François-Poncet, French Ambassador to Berlin. One of the French representatives at the Disarmament Conference is president of the Schneider-controlled Franco-Japanese Bank; a British representative is a brother of a Vickers director who, in turn, is also a director of the Financial Newspapers Proprietors, Ltd. and of the London *Economist*. Lord Hailsham, Secretary of State for War in MacDonald's National Government, is a Vickers shareholder, and Lord Reading, former Foreign Secretary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Viceroy to India, is president of Imperial Chemicals, Ltd. In Germany, Thyssen, who has contributed millions of marks to the Nazis, is president of the Vereinigte Stahlwerke, and Baron Krupp von Bohlen, head of the Krupp works, has just been made the Hugh Johnson of German heavy industry. And these are only the higher-ups. The influence of the 'Secret International' permeates European statecraft, finance, industry, and public opinion.

II

Does the same armament octopus grip the United States? George Seldes's new book, *Iron, Blood and Profits*, names most of the key men and corporations in the American munitions industry, and, if the Nye Committee expects to prove that American conditions duplicate those of Europe, it will have to discover the Bethlehem Steel Corporation owning the *New York Times*, Pierre Du Pont serving as a director of the Associated Press, J. P. Morgan lending money to William Randolph Hearst, Secretaries Swanson and Dern drawing large dividends from the shipbuilding and chemical industries, and perhaps John Dillinger receiving commissions from Remington Arms. No, if the Nye Committee expects any such sensational disclosures as have been made in Europe, it is doomed to disappointment.

Look back, for instance, at what went on in the United States between 1914 and 1919 when our armament industry enjoyed the biggest boom it had ever known, and consult Thomas W. Lamont's biography of his late partner, Henry P. Davison. 'No possible estimate could ever have been made,' writes Mr. Lamont, 'of the enormous tangible benefits flowing to American agriculture and industry from the proceeds of the great Anglo-French loan of $500,000,000, issued in October, 1915. Sixty per cent of its proceeds was spent in the Mississippi Valley alone.' The Morgan firm not only played a leading part in these transactions but at least one of its partners looks back with complete satisfaction on the record: 'Early in the War the members of the Morgan firm realized the benefits that would accrue to America's export trade if the Allies were able to find adequate credit facilities here. This was a leading consideration, which prompted J. P. Morgan & Co. to undertake the burden of leadership in practically all of the public loan operations in America of the British and French Governments during the first three years of the War. It was manifestly to the advantage of the American community to extend credit on such a scale to the Allied Governments as would enable the latter to continue their enormous purchases of American grain, cotton, copper, steel, leather, and other products.'

The part that the European armament makers played in fomenting and prolonging the War is now a familiar story. Yet, according to Mr. Lamont, 'it was manifestly to the advantage of the American community' to assist the European arms makers—and our own as well—in the profitable enterprise of mass murder. It was through the Morgan firm that D. A. Thomas, later Lord Rhondda, representing the British Ministry of Munitions, made 'some highly important Russian artillery-munition purchases, sponsored and guaranteed by the British.' This is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one of the few specific transactions mentioned by Mr. Lamont, who has also given as frank a description as one could ask for of the business proffered by the Allied Governments. 'The supplies that were bought had to do directly or indirectly with the waging of the War, but they covered the widest possible range—all the way from hobnails to locomotives—and included such diverse commodities as clinical thermometers, steel box cars, liquid chlorine, cretonne, corned beef, barbed wire, and gasoline. Of raw materials required to manufacture ammunition—shell steel, cotton linters, copper, spelter, and aluminum were bought in large quantities.' The reader must decide for himself whether the Allies bought more cretonne or barbed wire from the United States between 1914 and 1918.

But the wartime prosperity of America was not confined to the armament maker. As Mr. Lamont points out, 'no one can question the fact that our great material prosperity in the post-war years was in appreciable measure founded upon that solid basis of manufacture and commerce that the war demands of the Allies, guided and quickened by expert counsel and coöperation, served to establish.' Nor did this 'expert counsel' guide the Allies to favor companies in which the Morgan firm held an interest: on the contrary, 'the firm's total interests of this nature were almost nothing.' It therefore becomes equally difficult to represent either the munitions maker or the banker as the sole beneficiary of America's growing stake in an Allied victory, a stake that finally played an important part in bringing us into the War.

This, however, can be said. No government can wage war without both munitions and credit, and these two necessities were provided by individual Americans, who, in pursuing their own advantage, ultimately made the advantage of the whole country identical with their own. To Mr. Lamont this advantage is 'manifest,' and to other private bankers there have been equally 'manifest' advantages in extending credit to the nations of South America and Europe. Now it may not be the function of the Federal Government to prevent bankers from playing the public for a sucker in time of peace, but it certainly is the function of the Government to prevent either the banker or the munition maker—and they work so closely as to be indistinguishable and indissoluble—from committing the entire populace to war because of their own zeal for profits.

III

At this point a distinction must be drawn between Europe and the United States. Europe has its armament ring, its corrupt statesmen, its kept press. So has America. But American corruption, as Lincoln Steffens has so convincingly shown, extends everywhere. After a life of muckraking, Mr. Steffens concluded that corruption in America is not due to any wicked individual or wicked group but is part and parcel of 'the system.' No foreign muckraker of the 'Secret International' has come to a similar conclusion about Europe, and even the American Mr. Seldes, who ought to know his Steffens, lays the entire blame for all wars on fifty armament makers. However just this opinion may be in Europe, it has scant basis in the United States. On the continent of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe twenty-odd different nations, with different traditions and different languages, are crowded three times as densely into an area about the size of our own country. These nations have been divided against and among themselves for the past thousand years, and they also rule from afar about half the earth's surface. The United States, on the other hand, has fewer interests abroad and fewer alliances, it is not surrounded by hostile powers, and it does not know the meaning of overpopulation. Under such different circumstances could the American armament industry grow to European proportions?

Although the Nye Committee may not uncover an American armament ring on the scale of Europe's 'Secret International,' it can show that the private manufacture of arms and the private control of credit played a large part in prolonging the World War and finally causing the United States to intervene. And, if it seems desirable to prevent a repetition of the history of 1914 to 1918, the very least the Nye Committee can do is to prepare the way for legislation that would place an embargo on the shipment of all military supplies to any foreign power in time of war and that would prevent any private bank from extending credit abroad in wartime. The exposures of what the European armament industry has been up to during and after the Great War should be strongly emphasized in order that public opinion may understand the causes of modern war.

But, even if the Nye Committee takes no precautionary measures to prevent Mr. Morgan and his friends from again serving as intermediaries between American and foreign munitions makers and thus strengthening the hold of the 'Secret International' on the United States, we shall probably never again be able to remain at peace and supply the rest of the world with fighting equipment until its credit is exhausted. The recent exchange of notes between America, England, and Japan—to mention but one incident—shows how much more intimately we are involved in the possible Pacific war to-day than we were in the European war of twenty years ago. Our exporters, for instance, have gained a larger stake abroad, and such organizations as the Committee for the Nation, headed by the president of the Remington-Rand Corporation, which sells typewriters and office equipment to the whole world, could be utilized by the munitions industry. It is not that American exporters are consciously propelling the country into war; the point is that the arms industry, which has every reason to favor war, could appeal to them for support. Senator Nye's proposal of a 98 per cent tax on all wartime profits should therefore go far toward destroying the enthusiasm of our munitioneers for the one national policy that can make them rich. Let us first remove the vested interest in war for war's sake and then weigh the welfare of the American exporter against the welfare of the producer for the domestic market, which consumes 90 per cent of our output of goods.

Finally, the Nye Committee should ponder this warning from *Merchants of Death:* 'An alliance of governments with war industries threatens to make the arms makers supreme in economic life and, after that, in government. A world dominated economically and politically by the armament industry

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will eventually result, if wars continue unabated.' As yet the arms industry does not dominate the United States economically and politically, but recent events abroad indicate that the danger is real. Before Hitler came into power, Fascism, too, seemed a purely foreign, even a purely Italian, phenomenon, but Fascist tendencies have already appeared in the United States, some of them in connection with the New Deal, others in connection with independent groups. It would therefore be folly not to consider at once what measures might halt the growth of the arms industry, which, incidentally, has contributed directly to the growth of Fascism everywhere. To nationalize the manufacture of armaments would accomplish nothing—as *Merchants of Death* points out, the arms industry has become most powerful in the one nation where it is nationalized, Japan. And the British procedure of licensing munitions exports in time of peace has proved equally ineffective, for Vickers to-day is shipping arms to China, Japan, and Germany with the connivance of the National Government.

One fact the Nye Committee must face at the start—war threatens the whole world to-day. The munitions industry has already played a leading part in destroying the peace of Europe, but it is not the only belligerent force either at home or abroad. The investigation should therefore avoid, on the one hand, basing its case on the European thesis that the arms industry is solely responsible for the war danger; on the other hand, it should never forget that the arms industry is the chief beneficiary of war and that its ramifications extend to the world of finance as well as to industry. A great opportunity therefore arises to spike the guns of war with three measures—a wartime embargo on all munitions shipments, a wartime embargo on all private extensions of credit to any foreign power or foreign group whatsoever, and a 98 per cent tax on all wartime profits. Let us hope that the Nye Committee neither tries to do more nor fails to do less.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two German Orientalists analyze Japan's military ambitions in Asia and the war that has just broken out in Arabia.

The Orient *in* ARMS

From Tokyo to Aden

I. Japan's Real Game

By Karl Figdor

Translated from the *Deutsche Rundschau*, Leipzig Political and Literary Monthly

THE dictatorship that the white race has exercised over humanity for the past century has come to an end. It was during these years that the little Asiatic peninsula known as Europe overcame continent after continent economically and politically or else colonized them. But the sea of blood that flowed during the Great War drowned this chapter of history. An unprecedented crisis arose, inevitable and inescapable. The colored world is on the move. Asia, which fructified the race of men for thousands of years, has risen in revolt. In a billion people, consciousness has awakened that they are now strong enough to determine their own fate. Just as we have spoken of a 'yellow peril,' so to-day the words 'white peril' spread across Asia.

Where does this sudden understanding, this newborn power come from? It is not merely technology turning against its father. A new burst of national idealism has sprung from ancient wells, a deeply religious movement confronting the materialism of the white world and extending to Japan and Persia, to India, China, and Arabia. Fundamentally, it arises from the same desire for moral, spiritual, and political equality of treatment that we Germans have struggled for ever since the end of the War because we could not live without it. It is the recognition that a new world can arise only from the sources of national power. All of us, therefore, want the old order to collapse.

In the summer of 1932, Sadao Araki, who was then Minister of War

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Japan and remains one of the leading figures in his country though he has temporarily retreated to the background of the political stage, made this announcement in the columns of *Kaikosha*, the organ of the military association: 'The spirit of Japan must be spread over the seven seas and the five continents. Everything that opposes its expansion is to be overwhelmed, if necessary by force. The countries of eastern Asia have been oppressed by the white people. Japan will not tolerate this condition any longer. It is the duty of the Japanese people to oppose any action of the Powers that runs counter to Japanese rule. Manchuria and Mongolia are the outlets through which Japanese rule will spread. Japan desires a Mongolia for the Mongolians, in which security and peace are assured. It cannot permit a foreign Power to conquer there. Mongolia may prove to be a greater obstacle to Japan's peaceful mission than Manchuria was. We will not forget that the name Vladivostok means "mistress of the Far East" and that this Russian city still bears that name.'

These words are clear enough, and the elevation of the last Chinese emperor, Pu Yi, to the rank of Emperor of Manchuria and Mongolia is even more significant. It revives the tradition of the Middle Kingdom, which dominates the Greater Asia movement. Japan's troops now stand on the soil of Inner Mongolia. Not long ago the local princes were negotiating with the Nanking Government and seeking protection against the local military governors and above all against the northward-moving wave of Chinese peasants who were seizing grazing country from the northern nomads and driving their own herds farther and farther into the desert. But Nanking moved too slowly and weakly, and the Mongols announced their independence. The establishment of Japanese control is not far off, and Mongolia is about to be joined to Manchukuo.

Outer Mongolia, the home of Genghis Khan, the most fearsome world conqueror who ever lived, has a territory three or four times as big as Germany and has now become a restless member of the Soviet Union. Since 1921 this part of the world has been organized into Soviet territories on the Moscow model. The old chieftains have been deposed, and Buriats who were educated in Russia have become the heads of the governments. The foreign policy is directed from Moscow. Many thousand nationalistic Mongols have fled across the border to Inner Mongolia. Araki's attacks on Russia show what Japan's purpose is here. The Mongolian emperor, Pu Yi, will not have to wait long before the greatest of all pearls is added to his crown in spite of Stalin's fine phrases about 'foreign pigs' snouts in the Soviet potato patch.'

What is Japan's ultimate dream in respect to inner Asia? Immigration restrictions in the United States and the British Empire have blocked the best colonizing outlets to Japan's peasants, who have been ruined by an autocratic economic system. Japan's population grows at the rate of a million a year, and the attempts to find work and bread for this superfluity of human beings by means of incomparably rapid industrialization have failed. And in Manchukuo with its rich soil and wealth of raw mate-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rials, Japanese immigrants cannot compete against the peasants who have been driven here by hunger and floods from China proper. Furthermore, Japanese colonists cannot stand the cold winters or hot summers of Manchuria, and the social and climatic conditions in both Inner and Outer Mongolia are just the same, making large-scale settlement impossible. Nor is it certain that Mongolia contains any great amount of natural wealth.

The 'pacification' of these huge stretches of territory and the establishment of the *Pax Japonica* therefore indicates that their conquest is merely one stage in a larger operation. For the fact is that the ultimate purpose of this western expansion is of a purely political and military nature. The chief route across Asia passes through both Mongolias and along the Pamir plateau to what is now known as Eastern Turkestan. Here the greatest territorial kingdoms of the European-Asiatic world meet—China, Russia, the British Empire, and presently the new and greater Japan. It is from this point that the problem of Asia as a whole unfolds, and Japan's fantastic notion of setting up a huge empire of all Asia does not seem so utopian.

The creation of a Japanese sea by the seizure of the Russian Maritime Province, northern Sakhalin, and Vladivostok and the birth of a series of states under Japanese control like Manchukuo, Inner and Outer Mongolia, and, finally, Chinese Eastern Turkestan where Russian, Japanese, and British partisans have been fighting for months—all these are merely the first stages of that Asiatic Monroe Doctrine that has been announced in innumerable speeches, memoranda, and articles, written not only by Araki but by all responsible Japanese statesmen either anonymously or openly. The Mohammedan leader, General Ma, in Sin-Kiang, who is said to be in the pay of Japan, has won control of the whole district of Urumchi as far as the Russian border. This means a further intensification of Asiatic conflicts on the part of Japan, especially in the Chinese province of Kiangsu, which borders on Tibet and Mongolia. For Kiangsu is largely inhabited by Mohammedans who have always resorted to incomparably bloody warfare against Chinese domination. With almost inconceivable consciousness of purpose and with an energy that cannot fail to arouse amazement, Japan pushes the hands of the clock of world history further and further forward.

II

The fate to which Japan's ambitions of world mastery are subject leaves no other path open. The country must create the economic, political, and military conditions that will lead to the most bloody outcome possible. The other path Japan is following takes the southern route and opens up what Japan hopes will be a huge centre of overseas colonization for her peasants. French Indo-China and Australia stand out for climatic and technical reasons as the most favorable territories in the Pacific for Japanese settlement. There is hardly any pressure from Chinese emigration into French Indo-China, and Australia offers a whole continent almost as large as Europe and populated by only six and a half million people,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than half of whom live in four big coastal cities. For a long time Australia has believed that Japanese ambitions were confined to the tropical and sub-tropical northern part of the continent and kept insisting that with only a few exceptions that territory was not suitable for agriculture or grazing. Recently, however, the entire continent has been thrown into a state of panic and has recognized that Japanese ambitions now include those parts that have been so anxiously protected as a white man's country.

Perhaps the most drastic sign of how completely the world situation has been altered is that the white race has been thrown into a defensive position in Asia and the Pacific area. Two ideas, both of Asiatic origin, now threaten the whites: the new nationalism of the colored peoples and the Communism of Soviet Russia, which promises salvation to Asia and the world in its own bloody way. To understand the policies of the Great Powers to-day and to-morrow, each of these two dangers must be studied closely.

The United States of America feels less threatened by Communism than any other country. What America sees is Japan dominating the whole Pacific Ocean and threatening the Chinese market, which offers the last great hope for American export trade now that business with Europe and South America has declined. Hence the new ties that are being established with Russia; hence Litvinov's reception in Washington and the understanding that exists between these two Powers, in spite of all statements to the contrary, to follow a common policy toward Japan in the event of an emergency. England's eastern possessions and the safety of the empire itself are threatened by both dangers. Traditional British policy could be satisfied only if her two rivals, Japan and Russia, came into conflict as early as possible and England joined at the latest possible moment, perhaps because of Australia. France is a weak ally because her Indo-Chinese colonial empire is virtually unprotected against attack. France has a treaty of friendship with Japan, and a Franco-Japanese company has at last been established to exploit Manchukuo. France still seems to nourish some vague hope that she can remain a spectator in the Far East.

Recent developments in China are interesting. Here Communism is gaining more and more ground. Whole provinces have turned to Communism, which is strongest in southern Kiangsi and in Fukien where more than five hundred cities and villages have been completely sovietized. Perhaps this development may lead to a temporary agreement with Japan, for China clearly understands that she will be the scene of any future war. The Nanking Government is also unprotected and therefore incapable of taking sides openly. But it is arming. By 1936 Nanking will have 850 military airplanes, and numerous American instructors are now at work. The airplane orders going to the United States run into the millions.

The war in the east will be preeminently a war in the air. Japan itself is unassailable by sea or land and enjoys every advantage in these departments. The waters off northern Asia will be transformed into a mine field in any emergency. But if the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russian eastern army, in spite of being motorized and in spite of the genius of its leader, Blücher, has to fall back on the defensive, hundreds of Russian bombing planes are ready to attack the centres of industry and armaments in Manchuria and Japan.

The strategy of the Anglo-Saxon Powers thus becomes clear. To their fleets and bases falls the task of holding certain ports on the Pacific Ocean purely defensively and dispatching from them well-protected airplane transports, from which attacks can be launched at the centres of Japan. Everything depends on this development. The American air fleet is being increased head over heels. The English bases at Hong Kong and Singapore are being developed into airports of the first order. New airports and similar bases are being constructed on the coast of North Australia and at Port Darwin.

Furthermore, the peasants of France and England will be drawn into the chess game of central Asia in the wake of the Russians and the Japanese. Tibetan troops bearing English arms are marching into the Chinese provinces of Szechwan and northwest Yünnan. The French colonial military authorities are directing their attention toward the capital of Yünnan. Already victims are quietly beginning to fall as armies start to march across the prostrate body of the huge Middle Kingdom to establish themselves in firm positions. But China is an eternal colossus. In the thousands of years of its history it has undergone innumerable crises of this kind and has outlived them all. Thus China, with its mysterious popular strength and its capacity for astounding racial expansion, may emerge as the ultimate victor.

Those three strange allies, Russia, the United States, and England, still need time. Japan knows that after half a decade the Second Five-year Plan will be completed. The railway system will be regenerated. The centre of war industries will have been moved further east, and the Pacific area, both on sea and on land, will be in the hands of the Anglo-Saxon Powers, which are immeasurably stronger from the financial point of view. Thus, coldly weighing the chances that still remain, Japan must choose the moment in which she herself is best prepared, both from the economic and military point of view, to strike.

II. War in Arabia

By Dr. Wolfgang von Weisl

Translated from the *Neue Freie Presse*, Vienna Liberal Daily

THE European public has just discovered that a war has broken out in Arabia that may possess greater political significance than we suspect. To be sure, it is merely desert warfare between two rulers who have hardly more than two million subjects apiece and who are prevented by the nature of the country from bringing more than twenty thousand men into action. Arabia has neither enough bread nor water to support a larger body of troops. Nevertheless, the struggle between Ibn Saud, king of the Waha-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bis and the Hedjaz, and the Imam Yahya, king of Yemen, is an historic event of the greatest importance. The complete victory that Ibn Saud expects to win would unite all of Arabia under his rule. It would create a huge kingdom, the political importance of which would be felt in Syria and Palestine, in Iraq and the Persian Gulf.

II

I remember the telegrams and articles I wrote in 1926–27 from the Hedjaz, which has to-day become the field of conflict. More than six years ago I prophesied that war between Ibn Saud's kingdom and Yemen could not be avoided because the overpowering differences between these two states are based on geo-political factors. Italy, which had set up a kind of protectorate over Yemen at that time, could hold Ibn Saud in check and prevent war: any attack on Yemen would have had tragic consequences on the aggressor. As for the English, whose protection Ibn Saud had previously enjoyed, they were not interested in getting involved in a conflict with Mussolini, whose Near Eastern policy became very active in 1926. Thus peace was preserved. But my readers may remember that I never believed that this peace would last, and my ears were always ringing with the words of the ultimatum that King Ibn Saud dictated in my presence in the autumn of 1926 to the king of Yemen: 'We and the king of Yemen are the best of friends. We have but one conflict: if he attacks Asir, which is of our blood, we must protect it.'

Asir is the little country between Yemen and the Hedjaz. Up to 1926 it had been a Great Power in Arabia, including the whole southern coast of the Red Sea. But shortly before that time it was subdued by the Yemenites, defeated, and all but a small portion of it incorporated into the kingdom of Yemen. Thus Ibn Saud's ultimatum cut two ways—it might mean that he was merely protecting this last morsel of the kingdom of Asir, but it might also mean that he had all kinds of far-reaching plans that had to do with the rest of Asir, which had been subjected to Yemen. And such plans naturally found the warmest supporters in the court of the ruler of Asir, who had come under the protectorate of Ibn Saud.

Yemen is a mountain country, the coolest and most fertile part of Arabia. It is occupied by a comparatively dense agricultural population that also includes excellent artisans. The inhabitants of Yemen practise a religion basically different from that of the Wahabis. They belong to the same sect as the Persians, which means that they are Shiahs and are not subject to the caliphs of the Sunnis, whom the Hedjaz and the Wahabis obey. Whereas the Wahabis recognize no religious ruler but revere only the written law of the Koran, the Yemenites have in their king a man who is a descendant of one of their caliphs and is therefore their religious ruler as well. Their king, who maintains religious law with unbending strength, is the leader of their combined Church and State.

Yemen is almost the only part of Arabia that has any considerable export trade, for in order to export one needs harbors. Aden ought to be the chief port, but it is an English coaling station, and every attempt that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

king of Yemen has made to reach an agreement with the English has failed. But the king of Yemen did not want a friendly relationship with England and therefore put himself under the influence of Italy. Later, however, he invited a Soviet mission to Yemen, which became active in encouraging trade and did a great deal for the economic development of the country, which, of course, did not improve relationships with England. Since Aden opens on the Indian Ocean, which is controlled by England, Yemen had to seek an outlet on the Red Sea.

Here there is a coast line about four days' march in length and between 100 and 120 kilometres wide. It is hot country, but there are cool mountains behind it—the Tehama. This coast line has four ports. From south to north they include Mocha, which is famous for its coffee, Hodeida, the capital of Tehama, the seat of the government, and the next most important port in Yemen, Loheia, and, farthest north, the fortified, walled town of Medi or Midi, the largest city in modern Yemen near Asir.

These cities used to belong to Asir. They are inhabited by Sunnis and have therefore always been friendly to Ibn Saud. Furthermore, their inhabitants belong to a race that is very different from the Yemenites, with whom they have only one thing in common, economic interest. Clearly, the makings of a serious conflict are here, because England cannot remain indifferent if there arises near her own port of Aden a nation of two million inhabitants, such as the Soviet Russians were proposing, a nation that can receive war materials from Italian Somaliland and has an army commanded by Turkish officers. No wonder English policy tries to keep this part of the world peacefully inclined.

In this respect, England's interests conform with those of Ibn Saud, who has had a checkered career. As a fugitive and exile, as the son of a native prince, he spent his youth on the Persian Gulf and then returned with a handful of his friends to his father's former capital, captured it, killed the Turkish governor, and during the thirty years of his rule subdued all the other princes and kings of Arabia. Only the king of Yemen has prevented him from making the Arabian peninsula into a single political unit.

Their conflict was sharpened by the fact that Ibn Saud is an advocate of Mohammedan puritanism. He is a kind of Arabian Cromwell, whereas the king of Yemen cultivates religious pomp. Finally, Ibn Saud's economic desires have not been achieved. Although his huge kingdom has five times as much territory as his opponent's, it has hardly any more inhabitants than the other. It is largely a desert country. The kingdom of the Hedjaz and its capital, Mecca, are the most wretched stretches of country that one can imagine. This land depends for its economic existence on one source of income, foreign tourists, who make the religious pilgrimage one month a year. When the pilgrim season was good, King Ibn Saud had money and his subjects could live; but, when it was bad, dark clouds gathered on the horizon and his people conspired against him.

Under these circumstances it was important for the king to extend his economic field of influence and make

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his territory more self-supporting. I have always pointed out that Tehama is poorer than the Yemen hinterland. But, poor as it is, it is much richer than the Wahabi kingdom to the west. The four cities of Medi, Loheia, Hodeida, and Mocha would be valuable portions for Ibn Saud to occupy.

The Wahabis are accustomed to war. They live on it, thrive on it, and therefore desire it. Since 1925 Arabia has been at peace, which means that Ibn Saud has had to support his army instead of its supporting itself. The world economic crisis now oppresses Arabia, and it is no wonder that Ibn Saud's troops want war. They are naturally most eager to attack the richest parts of Asia Minor, Iraq and the legendary capital of Baghdad, which are hanging like ripe fruit to be plucked by any bold Arabian conqueror from the south. But the English are entrenched there, and, in spite of the pressure of his soldiers, Ibn Saud cannot risk a conflict with England.

The latest dispatches announce that Medi has fallen and that Ibn Saud's army with all the modern paraphernalia of tanks and airplanes has begun moving toward Loheia. Thus the position of the Yemenite crown prince will be threatened, since he lives in the northern mountains on the borders of Asir. For that reason the king of Yemen has offered to make peace. Ibn Saud's prospects of victory look good. His tall Bedouin soldiers are stronger physically and spiritually than their more effete opponents from the south. Above all I believe that the Yemenites have not got the slightest chance of offering effective resistance in the flat country along the coast. Ibn Saud has as good as conquered the Yemen ports, unless, for political reasons, he decides not to take some of them.

But it is a different story as soon as he shifts the war into the mountains. Here Yemen has a much better chance. The Wahabis are not accustomed to mountain warfare. They are helpless in the presence of a walled city, and in Yemen every house is a fortress. The cavalry of the Wahabis will have less effect than the modern weapons that England has provided, and the artillery of the Imam can block the few mountain passes at any time. Imam Yahya, whose Turkish officers have opposed an English army, will have an easy time with the brave but undisciplined Wahabis in his own country, and I therefore believe that it is already possible to prophesy how the struggle will develop. The war will not lead to any final peace but merely to more wars. Ibn Saud will have to content himself with gaining one or two seaports and letting his army get what moral satisfaction they can from having conquered an enemy that used to be considered the most powerful in Arabia.

Imam Yahya, on the other hand, will have to give up his wish to hold the petroleum island of Farsan, which belongs to the ruler of Asir, a vassal of Ibn Saud's. And he will also have to give up the salt mine of Geizan and content himself with holding the port of Hodeida only. This port he will never relinquish, and it will remain the cause of a new war between the two great Arabian Powers. The present conflict will not be the last of its kind.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Persons and Personages

Pundit Nehru

By Harold Laski

From the *Daily Herald*, London Labor Daily

SWARAJ is in his blood, for his father also was a gallant fighter in the cause of Indian freedom. But Mr. Nehru is a much more radical person than his father could ever have been. Where his father was gentle, compromising, patient, he is stern, unbending, ardent for immediate action. He no longer believes in the bona fides of the British raj. He sees it not merely as the protector of British vested interests but of Indian vested interests also.

He wants not merely a political revolution, which would free India from foreign domination; he wants also a social revolution, which would effect a complete change in India's economic system. To that, as he thinks, the rule of Great Britain is fundamentally opposed; and it is only when India is independent that she can effectively begin to set her own house in order.

On the bare threshold of middle age Nehru has many great qualities. He has courage, his willingness to go repeatedly to jail is proof of that, he has the self-confidence of the leader who knows what he wants, he has a winning and decisive personality.

I know few criticisms of our system in India more profound than the fact that we have been unable, in the post-war years, to win the loyalty of a single outstanding Indian who has any serious following behind him. Mahatma Gandhi, Lajpat Rai, C. R. Das, Vallabhai Patel, Nehru, everyone who in this last period has had a real hold upon the imagination of his fellow countrymen has been the passionate exponent of complete self-government. We hold India not by the quality of our rule, not by a reciprocal interest born of mutual good will; we hold India by the sword.

That has been painfully apparent in these last three years. No country is held by good will when fifty thousand people have to be sent to jail. No people accepts the rule of a conqueror when the first symptom of women's emancipation there is their full participation in the Gandhi movement.

Basically, we are unwilling to recognize that Indian nationalism is part of a basic revolt of the East against western tutelage, to which there is no answer save that of freedom. It is a lesson we should have learned from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our experience of America and Ireland. But it is also, as it seems, a lesson that an imperial race can understand only when it is too late. That is the price of empire.

We have given India a government amazingly free from corruption, eager to do justice in its own way, full of manifold good works. But we have never domesticated the system in the affection of the people. We have always been outside their confidence. We have done good to them; we have not thought it consonant with our dignity to realize that a people is infinitely happier in seeking to do good for itself. So that, when Indian nationalism was born, instead of seeking to make terms with it from the beginning, we threw it a concession here and there, as a bone was thrown to a dog. It was done always with arrogance, virtue, emphatic superiority. Now we are paying the price.

If anyone wants to know why Nehru is what he is, let him consider how the rule of Bengal is maintained. There has been ugly terrorism in Bengal, futile and wicked, the action, mostly, of young people barely out of their teens. To anyone not infected with the imperialist virus, that would indicate something gravely wrong.

It is an offense punishable by death to be in possession of arms. The Government may prohibit the publication of any document it thinks fit. It may hold trials in secret and in the absence of the accused. It may restrain the movements of persons under twenty-one. It may imprison up to three years for the possession of seditious literature.

The press is censored as in hardly any country outside Italy and Germany. There are military marches, accompanied by house searchings, and the saluting—it is alleged that this is sometimes forcibly exacted—of the flag. Collective fines are imposed on villages suspected of harboring terrorists. Punitive police are quartered on them. There are endless arrests without warrant, special tribunals, orders to citizens to report weekly, even daily, to the police, to stay in a particular place, or not to go to some particular area, or—I quote from a government order—to 'conduct themselves in a particular way.'

These are some of the things that have been done, are still being done, in our name in India; these are the things, I suggest, that lead to the bitter disbelief in our sincerity that characterizes Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Nehru. It is significant that not one of those Indians who continue to support us has a strong party behind him. It is significant, also, that moderates like Sir Tej Sapru and Mr. Sastri are not less hostile to ordinance rule than the avowed supporters of Congress. The path we are treading in India to-day leads in the long run to disaster.

No Indians of authority regard the White Paper proposals as satisfactory. They know that the 'safeguards' that surround them make the idea of responsible government at the centre a pathetic illusion. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

army, foreign affairs, commerce, minority rights, eight-tenths of the budget, a vast emergency authority will all be still in the Viceroy's hands.

The suffrage upon which the central legislature will be built is but a fragment of the population. The scheme of representation splits up the Indian people into fragments, and the entrance of the princes into the Federation gives a dominating influence to the most reactionary element in Indian affairs. Active-minded Indians will never accept such a scheme as a substitute for the home rule they demand. Its only result will be the renewal of agitation as soon as it becomes law. And though we may beat Congress—by the means to which I have drawn attention—this time, and perhaps another time, in the long run the Congress will beat us. For the Congress is, for good or ill, the articulate voice of India. We alienate it at our peril. By convincing it that we rely on force, we destroy the possibility of maintaining that good will out of which might still grow a free partnership between the British and Indian peoples.

We have alienated the politicians. The merchants are rarely friendly. The downtrodden peasant hears winds of doctrine that make him increasingly believe that the British raj stands between him and social improvement. Indian students and Indian teachers alike are dissatisfied with their status. Like the Third Estate of France in 1789, having been nothing, they desire to be something.

We are niggardly where we should be generous. We outrage where we ought to encourage. We have not learned the great lesson of Burke when he insisted that a great empire and little minds go ill together.

Charlie Chaplin's Decline

By Lorenzo Turrent Rozas

Translated from *ruta*, Jalapa, Mexico, Communist Literary Monthly

SINCE *City Lights*, the public has responded unfavorably to Charlie Chaplin and is beginning to censure him as sentimental, deficient in technique, or stubbornly clinging to the silent films of the past, whereas only a short time ago he was treated almost with servility: 'two, three, four geniuses have illuminated this century—Charlie Chaplin and . . .' Now even Maxim Gorki has criticized him seriously and with penetration. What is the reason for this displeasure and censure?

Like all others of my generation, I feel the same affection for Chaplin that I do for those teachers who first taught us how to read, for in his films we began to discover the injustices of a régime and enter the first grade of the revolution. It was the period in which we became acquainted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the anarchist literature of Kropotkin, the prince who had given away his fortune and entered the ranks of revolutionary fighters. Kropotkin was also a teacher of rebellion. And what a similarity existed between him and Chaplin, between the aggressive anarchy of the former and the timid anarchy of the latter! Both failed in the same way—their anarchist position of sterile negation led them inexorably to defeat. For the anarchist, in spite of all his protests, finally becomes involved with the society he repudiates. Weary of destroying and unable to build anything new, he surrenders.

TO ABANDON the routine of the Institute and take refuge in a Chaplin movie was a liberation. We learned more by contemplating the poverty that engulfed him, the sadness of his deformed shoes, the desolation of his miserable moustache than by listening to pedantic lectures by professors of psychology, history, or algebra. Above all, Chaplin was mute; he did not trouble us with language lessons. And what humanity lay in him and in everything that happened to him. He contrasted wealth and excessive poverty. He seemed to have been born in a garbage can—the garbage can of the capitalist régime. Besides, he portrayed life in Yankeeland, and not all that we heard of that country in those days was true, not all workers there earned fabulous salaries and had automobiles. There was misery, or, at least, there was Chaplin, the vagabond who made the police run in circles when he tried to steal so that he could eat.

In those days Chaplin should have been studied in proletarian moving-picture houses, for one cannot conceive of him elsewhere. His pictures were featured in those ancient wooden buildings where the people rustled when he leaned on his flexible cane; and they would sneeze, laugh, and scratch their fleas. In the shadows of those theatres we laughed again with the same laughter that nourished our forefathers. Our lungs expanded, our stomachs danced, our mouths opened and closed rapidly, chewing the hall's darkness. The audience laughed as if it had a single throat. When the show had ended, one had a sense of well-being as if one had just returned from the country. Chaplin disarmed one and expelled the poisons that accumulate in cities.

For us, Chaplin was the restorer of the sane laughter of Cervantes, the laughter that romanticism tried to hide under a torrent of false tears. Chaplin was the explorer of the lost continent of laughter. Only Cervantes and Chaplin have laughed in this masculine way. It is the healthy laughter of the sea when it is grazed by the quick wings of birds, when it opens its enormous sunlit mouth, showing the green gums of its waves and the white teeth of its foam.

Is this the only reason we loved Chaplin? No. With his laughter he shaped projectiles to hurl at the squat edifice of capitalism, at the unjust

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

society that inhabits it. Chaplin made bombs of laughter—he was a dynamiter who provoked tremendous explosions. That's really why we liked him.

Perhaps without wishing to, perhaps because he was compelled by art itself, Chaplin made films that criticized a régime. He portrayed the society of the so-called 'paradise of capitalism' with a purpose that might be called revolutionary. As evidence we can examine briefly three films—*Gold Rush*, *The Circus*, and *City Lights*.

Gold Rush must go down in the history of the film as a work of genius, and in the future it will be studied as we study the classics. Goethe, Dante, and Cervantes captured a moment in the history of humanity and left it alive in their books. This film also reflects a moment in the development of society, and it is one of the harshest criticisms ever made of capitalism in its last stage. Future society, the society without classes, will understand in it many things that would otherwise be inexplicable. Here is portrayed a class blinded by petty greed, a class that lives the life of some inferior zoölogical species, that wallows in the slime of its egotism. With what penetration Chaplin explores the depths where he discovers all its misery—for example, when he touches upon the theme of bourgeois love.

For if Chaplin restores laughter to us, on the one hand, on the other, he digs the grave of bourgeois love. One must not be deceived by his sentimentality; it is merely the pick he uses to reach the copper beneath the silver plate. Why don't the women in his films like him? In the first place, because he is a poor man eternally wandering from place to place. He does not fit into the classic Yankee home. What home could a man have who is always being chased by people and, worst of all, by the police? The women think of this and begin to dislike him. But above all they imagine that on the day after the wedding he may cynically begin to fry one of his great shoes to feed them, as he did in *Gold Rush*. His children might inherit the same sadness, the same tendency to slide down the path of misery. Chaplin understands this and, for that reason, ends by leaving the woman he loves and handing her over to another man—to the most stupid man of all, the man who can make the most money and live in such an absurd society.

The Circus has the same critical purpose. There is nothing better than a circus to portray the vicious exploitation of man by man. The tightrope walker balances, the trapeze artist flies over the abyss that may swallow him, the humble woman exposes her body so that a Japanese—is it not always a Japanese?—can throw daggers around her, all for the sake of fattening the owner of the circus, who, in the end, remains with the fruits of all their efforts. Chaplin protests, but his protest is timid and useless. Confronted by the injustice of the great thief, the owner of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the circus of world capitalism, he can only snatch a handful of straw and tear it to pieces with all the rage of impotence.

City Lights exhibits among other things the idiotic life of a millionaire, the life of the golden calf, of the gentleman who does not know what to do with all his money and resolves to get drunk morning, noon, and night. This is the only way he can humanize himself a little. He fraternizes with Chaplin and invites him to share his pleasures, but, when the fumes of intoxication have dissipated, he chases him and kicks him out of his house.

Chaplin and his art triumphed in the boom days of Yankee capitalism, when its real contradictions had not produced the noisy agony that exists to-day in spite of the extreme measures taken by President Roosevelt. Chaplin protested but without really doing any damage. He did not endanger 'orderly people' or powerful forces. And how he made one laugh! One could see Chaplin and still ignore the disturbing leaven in his films, at least the rich possibly thought so. But the worker has a different reaction. Chaplin showed the injustices of a badly organized society, and after laughter there was a bitter taste in the mouth, but nothing more. Why? Because the films were anarchist in character, that is, they gave the impression that the social organization that Chaplin criticized would endure and that one could not exchange it for another society that would be more just and less inhuman. What was left for the worker? Nothing, except perhaps bombs of laughter or handfuls of straw.

Then came the age of the failure of Yankee capitalism. All its splendor began to decay to the amazement of whose who had believed it unshakable. Bankruptcies multiplied. There was 'overproduction,' which found no outlet on the market, hunger, and, with hunger, angry protest. Jobless men appeared, numbered by the million—millions of hands forced to be idle, millions of mouths tortured by hunger. Repression likewise appeared, for the police wished to silence voices that were heard. A woman—a radiant symbol—chained herself in order to talk and, while they tried to 'free' her, cried out in bold accusation.

And then commenced, too, the decay of Chaplin, for when hunger attacks the masses one can laugh no longer; when anguish grips the working class there is no longer any room for blind, anarchistic, undirected protest. Collective sorrow has pointed a path to follow—the road of Marx and Lenin. Under these conditions Chaplin becomes even an accomplice of capitalism. His films disorientate and confuse men who are struggling for the final victory of the disinherited. Chaplin loses his appeal. In Mexico poor people make caricatures of the genial clown, and at working-class festivals these caricatures are laughed at and beaten.

It is the end of *The Circus*. All the workers have marched off. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exploiter has taken them to another town. The woman whom Chaplin loved has also gone away. He is left alone in the arena, with his customary figure and sadness. Suddenly he pulls himself together. He bows for the sake of bowing, bows to the solitude. He twirls his cane and puts his somnambulant shoes into motion. He goes off, wherever his bad luck will take him. When the film ends he is lost on the horizon.

In the same fashion, I see Chaplin in his decadence—alone, seated in the limited arena of his art. He explores the horizon. There is no road for him to follow. To insist on the old one is impossible, and to go where the workers are now marching is also impossible. To do that he would have to throw away the ballast of his millions.

His fate is inevitable. As in *The Circus*, he will have to pull himself together and set out for the horizon that is growing fainter, the horizon of an epoch that will founder with him.

Switzerland's President

By Georg Ruttkay

Translated from the *Neue Freie Presse*, Vienna Liberal Daily

Marcel Pilet-Golaz, president of Switzerland, is the youngest member of the Swiss Government. He has not yet reached the age of forty-five and has been a member of the Swiss Cabinet for six years, having been in charge of the railway and post-office departments. He owes his position to three important circumstances—his ability, his energy, and his youth. He was made head of the state because of the increasing demand for young blood in the government.

M. Pilet-Golaz is a tall broad-shouldered man with a bright face, a little blond moustache, and big blue eyes. The President comes from the canton of Waadt in western Switzerland. Before he became a member of the Cabinet and then chief of state, he was a lawyer in his native city. He did military service in his early youth and rose to the rank of first lieutenant. He speaks openly and frankly about every problem that affects his country to-day. Our conversation lasted well over an hour, and the President answered all the questions I asked him.

'What is your opinion of the political situation in Switzerland, Mr. President, after the election of March 11?'

'I quite understand,' replied the President, 'why people abroad regard that election very differently from the way we do. In order to understand it properly one must be familiar with the institution of the popular election and the way that institution operates. Since the adoption of the present constitution, the Swiss people have voted against many measures

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that their governments proposed. In doing so they have never criticized their representatives; indeed, one should rather say the opposite. Many governments have had their proposals rejected, yet they enjoyed complete popularity in the best sense of the word. I am convinced that the majority of the Swiss nation, after March 11, as well as before, remains true to order in the state and will not permit that order to be seriously disturbed. The majority who voted against the Government is drawn from very different parties that represent conflicting tendencies. Moreover, there are always about a hundred or a hundred and fifty thousand who vote "no" on principle.'

'Mr. President, what do you think of the interpretation that foreigners are placing on the resignation of Councillor Musy and the fate of the Swiss franc? Was there any connection between the two?'

The President answered with a smile. 'Of course, rumors are circulating that can be explained only by a complete ignorance of the situation and a desire for unsound speculation. Ever since I have been at the head of the Government there has never been any difference of opinion in the Cabinet on the necessity of maintaining the gold standard in Switzerland and the necessity of maintaining the present parity of the gold franc. The policy of the Cabinet has never varied in this respect and never will. Anyone who considers the relationship of Switzerland toward the outer world will agree that there can be no doubts on this score.'

'Does n't the Cabinet believe it is necessary to take defensive measures against attempts to speculate in Swiss francs?'

'One should not exaggerate the dangers of speculation, especially an attack against a strong sound currency. Nor should one exaggerate the effectiveness of secondary measures that can be used against it,' replied the President. 'The best defense is a sound financial policy and a balanced budget. Swiss financial policy has always been sound, and, as far as the budget is concerned, the balance that was upset a year ago as a result of the crisis has been restored. May I add that the receipts from the postal and railway monopolies have increased and should grow still further because the administration is permeated with the spirit of economy? Finally, the position of our national bank, which is in close contact with the banks of issue in other states on the gold standard, is the most solid possible.'

My next question ran, 'According to rumors that have spread abroad, the National-Socialist movement has made some headway in Switzerland. Has the Swiss Government taken any measures against it?'

'People who spread these rumors are either interested in having them spread or badly informed,' replied the President. 'It is impossible to avoid imitating certain foreign procedures, but the National-Socialist

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movement as such can never become a real danger in Switzerland because it contradicts the fundamental conception that the Swiss citizen has of the state. Government employees will take the same attitude toward the movement as they do toward other movements. They will tolerate it in so far as it can be reconciled with constitutional freedom, but they will take measures against any outrages that it may commit.'

'There is a lot of talk to the effect that the famous democracy of Switzerland is in danger, and that Swiss democracy, the oldest in Europe, is soon going to become an authoritarian régime.'

The President looked thoughtful for a moment and then said in the most decisive tones, 'It is hard for a Swiss to answer that double question, first, because there can be no other form of government in Switzerland except democracy, second, because everything depends on what is meant by the words "authoritarian régime." It is incontestable that circumstances everywhere require a strong firm government that can guide the country through all the difficulties that the world crisis has produced.'

'May I put the question this way and ask you, Mr. President, what your opinion is of the future of Switzerland?'

'I have no illusions. The future of Switzerland, as of all other nations, will be a difficult one although our country has remained comparatively fortunate. Nevertheless, we have suffered rather seriously and rather suddenly from events abroad. Since Switzerland is economically and socially very closely tied to other civilized countries, especially its neighbors, it has been affected by the universal crisis. But the fact that it has maintained itself through all the storms of six centuries leads me to believe that we shall have reason to be as proud of the country's future as of its past.'

I then put a final question regarding the President's opinion of the relations between Switzerland and the neighboring states.

His answer ran as follows, 'In recent years relations have been more and more friendly. They will undoubtedly remain so, perhaps with some variations, depending on time and circumstances. Of course, economic difficulties are likely to arise, but there is no reason to believe that any differences cannot be solved in a way that will do justice to both parties.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These three articles from England include an inside story of the armament racket and a pair of humorous essays.

BRITISH Miscellany

A Trilogy from England

I. Inside Story of the Vickers Meeting

By a Shareholder

From the *New Leader*, London Independent Labor Weekly

EVEN a shareholder may turn, and, as the chairman, the Hon. Sir Herbert Lawrence, found, there are some things that even a hard-boiled company like Vickers cannot get away with. In consequence, the annual general meeting, held appropriately on the Monday of Holy Week, was an exciting enough affair. A handful of shareholders attempted to exercise their legal rights, and there was consternation and confusion among the directors.

The rebels, it is true, were not quite the type one might have expected. I confess previous research into the shareholders at Somerset House had led me to hope that Dean Inge might have had time to attend. He would have represented so adequately those five hundred or so priests of the English church who hold armament shares. The Clergy Pensions Institution, too, I hoped, might have had a representative there. After all, in Somerset House their holding is shown to be ten times that of the chairman himself. But the paid advocates of the 'Prince of Peace' were conspicuous, if not for their absence, at least for their silence.

I was a little late. As I entered Sir Herbert was remarking pleasantly, 'In land armaments there has been a satisfactory increase in orders. It is not easy,' he continued, 'to understand the prejudice that appears to exist among a small section of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public against the so-called armament firms, which are just as much a part of the defense system of this country as the forts defending Portsmouth Harbor.' The effect of this noble passage was a little spoiled by a loud and ironic laugh from the back of the hall. From the whisper of a shareholder I learned that the forts at Portsmouth were of a somewhat mediæval nature.

It was not, however, until the chairman asked in a formal way whether there were any questions that the real fun began. Immediately Miss Eleanor Rathbone, M.P., was on her feet. She had in her hand a copy of a German newspaper. Vickers, she said, were advertising tanks in it. 'Ah,' replied Sir Herbert Lawrence, 'of course, that is not intended for the Germans, but for our old and valued clients in South America.' 'But,' said Miss Rathbone, puzzled, 'I have a letter in my hand here from the editor of the paper in question who says that the paper has a circulation of less than eight hundred copies outside Germany. Will the chairman give an assurance that Vickers are not, directly or indirectly, rearming Germany?' There was a pause. 'I cannot give a definite assurance of that nature,' said Sir Herbert, and, amid the applause of shareholders, he hastily turned to other business.

There was worse to come. Mr. Gifford, the well-known Cambridge economist, was tactless enough to refer to the case of Mr. A. V. Lander. ('A very delicate matter,' said the chairman.) Mr. Gifford wanted the directors to issue a considered denial of the charges made against Mr. Lander, late Vickers agent in Turkey and last August expelled as a spy. He read extracts from the *Chicago Tribune* to show what was thought of the case in America. ('The worst kind of sensational journalism,' said the chairman.) Mr. Gifford remarked that ill-disposed persons in America were forever pointing out that Sir John Gilmour and Sir Philip Cunliffe-Lister were shareholders in the company. 'It is not too much to say,' he concluded, 'that this incident has done the greatest harm to the prestige of British industry and made America deeply suspicious of even the British disarmament proposals.'

Sir Herbert Lawrence, however, thought that the matter was unimportant. Lander had some private quarrel with a Turkish official, and, all in one breath, Sir Herbert put the resolution that the report and the accounts be received and adopted. Mr. Gifford was on his feet protesting. Most of the shareholders were shouting. Above the storm the voice of a Mr. Bing could just be heard, moving the rejection of the directors' report. A young clergyman apparently tried to second the rejection, but even before he could give his name he was howled down.

Amid this confusion the report was declared to have been carried. Someone seemed to be opposing the reëlection of retiring directors. Some shareholders, apparently unaware of the exact nature of the motions before them, voted consistently for both sides.

In the comparative calm that followed, someone moved a vote of thanks to the directors. Another shareholder, who up till now had been making vain efforts to speak, seized the chance of seconding the vote of thanks.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He was surprised, he said, to hear the chairman say in his speech that Vickers, either directly or indirectly, had any influence with any British or foreign newspapers. He gave the name of a Mr. Bryce, who combined the Vickers agency in Belgrade with being local correspondent for the *Times*. In Bucharest, he said, the *Times* appointed as their correspondent a Mr. Boncescu, a man of no journalistic experience. He, too, oddly enough, was Vickers' agent. When Mr. Boncescu lost the Vickers job, strangely enough, he lost the *Times*, too.

'But,' said the shareholder, "this inexplicable association between a great newspaper and Messrs. Vickers still continues. When Mr. Boncescu resigned, a young man in the Vickers office took over the *Times* job, although he, too, strangely enough, had no previous journalistic experience. In Prague . . .' But the rest was lost in the shouts of shareholders, tired business men baying for their lunch.

It was a very successful meeting. As one of the leading journals of the Left said in reporting it: 'Of course, no one accuses Vickers of not playing fair.' No, of course not!

II. The New Argosy

From the *Economist*, London Financial Weekly

[*Extract from a popular history: circa* 2934 A.D.]

OF WORLD history before the first half of the twentieth century we know little. As, one by one, the more advanced countries of the world embraced Fascism, side by side with the subjugation of the more backward races went the complete obliteration of all objective historical records. From the comparative study of the history text-books employed in the schools of the new states we have records of battles of which the dates often synchronize but in which victory is claimed in each case for the nation in whose language the event is recorded. Apart from this, and from various obviously mythical figures and legends, we have nothing except the older Jewish records, which stop short some two thousand years previously.

For two hundred years after the close of the twentieth century we have, of course, the modern Jewish chronicles that form the foundation of contemporary historical science. Unfortunately these lack precision for the period from 1932 to the end of the century, owing to the confusion and turmoil in the thick of which they were written, for—as every schoolboy knows—in the midst of this period the Great Cruise commenced.

In spite of the inexactitude of our information, or perhaps even because of it, this period is among the most fascinating episodes of history. However, in a work of this description, one cannot dwell too long upon the *minutiæ* of the period. One cannot pause, for example, to weigh the evidence for or against the view that the term 'Marxist' (frequently employed in such polemic Fascist writings as have survived, and are intelligible, as a term of reproach for the Jews) origi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nated in connection with the nineteenth-century writings of one, Harpo Marx, a semi-mythical figure, one of four brethren of considerable influence of whose work nothing has survived, or derived from one, Karl Marx, a popular actor, orator, and mimic, who was prominent among the agitators for the Great Cruise. We need only recapitulate this oft-recounted story.

Expelled first from Germany, then from Austria, then in rapid succession from the rest of the civilized nations as they fell under the sway of Fascism, simultaneously excluded from the colonial empires of the new states, the Jewish race finally found itself concentrated under conditions of considerable overcrowding in Ireland, the last state to embrace Fascism. Ireland, indeed, never went Fascist of her own free will, but with the subjugation of the country by Dictator Elliot, about 1950, the problem of what to do with the Jews finally raised its head. They could not be allowed to remain in colonized Ireland, and there was no other land to which they could go.

To-day everyone knows the solution that was arrived at, but it is of interest to the historian to review its economic antecedents. From the end of the war of 1914–18 all the nations of the world had been pursuing the end of economic self-sufficiency, refusing to purchase foreign goods and at the same time attempting to force their exports on the world markets by means of subsidies and currency depreciation. This, of course, resulted in the redundancy of the majority of the world's shipping; those ships that were running could only do so with the help of state subsidies and, in pursuit of the same somewhat-elusive principle, shipbuilding was simultaneously subsidized.

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that, even before the eruption of Fascism, the only use that it was found possible to make of the bulk of this shipping was to convey selected sections of the populations of the maritime nations a certain distance out to sea and then to return. It is not known if this is the custom referred to in surviving contemporary documents as 'showing the flag'; it is clearly established, however, that it was popularly known as 'cruising.' With the coming of Fascism and the acceleration of these autarkic tendencies, cruising became more and more necessary and was finally rendered compulsory. It caused, however, much discontent on account of the disruption that it introduced in the economic life of nations.

By a bold sweep of the imagination Elliot combined the solution of these two problems. In 1953, the year in which the modern Jewish chronicles commence, the Jewish race put out to sea. Ships of all nations under a quota scheme divided the migrants among them, and for a whole week a line of ships traversed the gray waters of the Irish Sea with their prows turned toward sunnier lands. It is not certain with what feelings the majority of the Jews entered upon their new life. Against a background of murder and persecution, which had been their lot for a generation, it must have seemed not unpleasant. In evidence of this view one may quote the complete failure of an agitator by the name of Mosley, who had at an earlier date been prominent among British Fascists but had left them for the cause of Jewry when the leadership passed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from his hands into those of Elliot to organize a last revolt on the eve of embarkation. And in passing one may note among the difficulties of recreating the history of this period the unaccountable manner in which contemporary records tend to confuse this Mosley with two quite-distinct persons, one a Conservative and one a Socialist minister.

Whatever may have been the original emotions of the migrants, it is impossible to doubt that in a very short time they became converted to a complacence almost amounting to enthusiasm for their new manner of life, for the solution that had originally been confined to the utilization of shipping became adapted in respect to all other economic surpluses. All the world was now self-sufficing. In England the plough drove its way through the stony foothills of the Welsh mountains, and wheat waved thinly upon the Derbyshire dales. In South America, with steel-shod wooden apparatus, subsistence farming replaced the old order. Synthetic rubber and synthetic wine were in use in all northern countries. Yet, driven by the spur of national prestige, each country strove to force the world to accept its exports. As technical progress developed, this need became greater because the all-embracing control of the corporate state fixed prices, wages, and profits.

To this difficulty also the universal deportation of the Jews provided a solution. The surplus output of the world poured into the holds of their vessels. Argentina and Australia contributed wheat and meat; Europe, metals and textiles; America, foods and finished products. Higher and higher rose the golden flood. For two hundred years the Jewish race wandered happily about the pleasanter seas of the globe. In leisure and amid a steadily developing luxury, which justified their ancient prophecies of a land flowing with milk and honey, they gave themselves to the philosophy and art they loved so well, recreating and surpassing on the high seas that heritage of culture that was everywhere being destroyed upon land. . . .

III. One of the Best

By Jan Struther

From the *Spectator*, London Conservative Weekly

An uncle of mine, who had a quite fantastically ugly housekeeper, was in the habit of reproving his wife when, in her impulsive way, she referred to some moderately plain person as 'the most hideous woman in the world.' 'Steady on, my dear,' he would say. 'That leaves one nothing for Mrs. Mackillop.'

I was reminded of this yesterday by hearing two men in a bus discussing a third.

'And what about George?' said the first.

'George?' the other echoed. 'Oh, George is one of the best. Not much of a talker, of course, but the sort of chap who'd never let you down.' I held my breath, fascinated, making an inward bet; and, sure enough, he added in a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

second or two, 'Children and animals absolutely worship him, and I always think that's the biggest test.'

It was a complete portrait of George in three strokes. I could see him, pipe and all, in my mind's eye: the sort of man who looks his best in a mackintosh. A good fellow, certainly, but not —and this is the point—one of the best.

True, he may be the average Englishman's idea of the best. But the trouble with the English is that their standards have been lowered by too much tolerance. Tolerance is their outstanding characteristic, making allowances,—at any rate for their own fellow countrymen,—the most flourishing industry they possess. But a mind can become so broad as to be practically shapeless; and the danger of a charitable outlook is that it so often leads to the glorification of the mediocre. It begins with not thinking the worse of a man because he is not clever and ends with thinking the better of him because he is stupid. It begins by excusing his lack of eloquence and ends by making a virtue of his taciturnity. It begins with noting that even a criminal may retain the affection of his child and his dog and ends with believing that children and animals are infallible dowsers of excellence.

Which (to take the last point first) God knows they are not. One of the chief trials and disillusionments of dog owning or parenthood is the utterly appalling people that the cherished creatures make friends with—the toughs on beaches, the oicks in buses, the bores and ne'er-do-weels among your own acquaintance, upon whom they fling their persons, their affection, and their respect. 'And yet,' you muse, 'they seem to be fond of me, too. Am I like that? Or, worse still, do they wish that I were?' A thought so unendurable demands instant comfort: you find it in the reflection that children and animals are charming immaturities, lacking in judgment and devoid of discrimination.

As to the second point, which has been put forward in George's favor, namely, that 'he would never let you down.' I grant that this is a virtue, but not so rare a one, surely, as to be singled out for such emphatic comment. Civilized human beings do not, on the whole, let one another down. Benevolence is a stronger instinct than malice, coöperation than hostility. Chronologically, both in the history of the race and in the life of the individual, love comes before hate. Crooks and murderers are rare in comparison with the uncounted hordes of honest and amiable men; and it is the exception rather than the rule to be robbed by an absconding partner or to have your secrets betrayed by a confidant.

This being so, why should George receive such a thumping pat on the back? To refrain from letting people down is something, but it is not enough: does he, I should be interested to know, ever lift people up? Does he kindle them to action by his vitality, quicken them to laughter by his humor, or inspire them to creation by his intelligence? If he does none of these things, then he is still not 'one of the best,' though he never broke a promise or committed adultery in his life.

And now for the other remark, the first and most telling stroke in the Portrait of George. 'Not much of a talker.' The words were deprecating enough, but the tone in which they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were uttered belied them. It was heavy with the flotsam and jetsam of age-old prejudices and half-digested copybook maxims. Still waters, it implied, run deep; least said is soonest mended; speech is silver, but silence is golden; and the French are filthy frogs and jabber your head off.

Things have come to a pretty pass, I must say, if men are to be blamed for exercising the power that is said to distinguish them from the beasts—a point of view that reaches its pinnacle of absurdity in Carlyle's famous dictum that 'no speech ever uttered or utterable is worth comparison with silence.' (Jane must have got a lot of quiet enjoyment out of that.) Was any statement ever so demonstrably untrue? Certainly, speech may sometimes do harm, but so may silence—and a worse harm at that. No offered insult ever caused so deep a wound as a tenderness expected and withheld; no spoken indiscretion was ever so bitterly regretted as the words that one did not speak. Moreover, the injuries done by speech can usually be cured by speech; whereas those caused by silence are merely aggravated and deepened by further silence and must come at last to words for their healing.

So much for the debit side. As for the credit—what good does silence do in the world? At the best, it may help you to catch a fish, save you from betraying your ignorance, or allow somebody else to get off to sleep. But these are small benefits compared with those of speech. If silence is really golden, which I quarrel with, then speech is the purest platinum inlaid with diamonds. It spreads wisdom, dispels ignorance, ventilates grievances, stimulates curiosity, lightens the spirits, lessens the fundamental loneliness of the soul, and is indispensable to the proper enjoyment of love-making.

But fighting proverbs with reasonable arguments is uphill work. Quicker, perhaps, and surer, to bring up a battery of counter-proverbs. 'A lame tongue gets nowt' is a good one. And here is an older and a better: 'From a cholerick man withdraw a little; from him that saies nothing, forever.' And when it comes to quotations, there are many that one might marshal against Carlyle's piece of didactic folly. 'O! have a care of natures that are mute,' says Meredith in *Modern Love*. And no less reputable a person than Keble assures us that 'strong men delight in forceful speech.' Strong men! In other words, Georges. But that, alas! was a hundred years ago. Nowadays, it seems, we are expected to choose between the S. S. M. and the voluble decadent—the former complacently inarticulate, the latter arrogantly weedy; between the Hearty Man, who—on that hackneyed and hypothetical desert island so dear to amateur psychologists—would build you a hut but bore you to death in a week, and the Arty Man, who would talk to you quite brilliantly while you died of starvation and mosquito bites.

But there are, thank God, a few exceptions, a few who are loved not only by children and animals but by discerning adults as well; who not only never let you down but are constantly buoying you up; and who, into the bargain, are capable of wise and witty conversation. They are rare, it is true, but they exist, and if people in buses are to be allowed to refer to George as 'one of the best'—well, what, so to speak, is there left for Mrs. Mackillop?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One of the greatest men now living has again become a centre of controversy. Leon Trotski presents the case for his projected 'Fourth International' and an orthodox Communist makes answer.

TROTSKI
Pro *and* Con

A Revolutionary Debate

I. Interviewing Trotski

By C. A. S.

From the *New Leader*, London Independent Labor Weekly

It was all rather breath-taking. Driven at midnight to a station in Paris; put on a train but kept ignorant of destination; leaving the train according to instructions at a certain time; recognized by a comrade, armed with a telegraphed description of us; whirled off for a further journey; admitted past various obstacles; and finally greeted with tempestuous heartiness by Leon Trotski himself.

We settled down to business immediately and for over ten hours, with breaks only for meals, plied one of the world's most distinguished revolutionaries with questions. No one could fail to be impressed by the man's enormous vitality or charmed by his frank and eager courtesy. Clear analytical exposition, supplemented by a wealth of vivid imagery and forceful metaphor, made his conversation both an intellectual and an æsthetic delight.

'You are aware,' I said, 'that at the Paris Conference of Revolutionary Socialist Parties the Independent Labor Party voted against the main resolution (because we considered the condemnation of the Comintern unbalanced and exaggerated) and also against the proposal to form a Fourth International. We are consequently particularly desirous of hearing: (a) your chief criticism of the Comintern,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(b) why you despair of its reform, (c) what action you propose taking.'

II

Trotski's criticisms, delivered with great verve and clarity, related both to the Communist International's policy and to its organization. The latter he declared to be bureaucratic, and corruptly bureaucratic at that. Discussion is stifled, criticism is regarded as disloyalty, and all who oppose the bureaucratic tops are expelled as heretics.

Bolshevist self-criticism, said Trotski, is a departed glory. In the early days, even during the civil war, perfect freedom of discussion was the rule. In the Red Army there was strict military discipline with severe punishment, yet even there in policy discussions private soldiers, as party members, frequently attacked Lenin (as well as Trotski himself) or the Central Committee as a whole and criticized them unsparingly. During the civil war a congress was held every year, with an additional congress in a case of emergency; now five years pass and there is no Comintern congress.

Functionaries of the Comintern Presidium are changed by the decree of the Political Bureau of the C.P.S.U. (Communist Party of the Soviet Union). Brandler, the German Communist-Party leader, criticized the Comintern policy in Germany. He was summoned to Moscow and detained there several years, finally getting away by extraordinary methods. If a man refuses to go to Moscow when ordered thither, he is immediately expelled from the Party.

This suppression of internal criticism, insisted Trotski, arises from the determination of the Stalinist faction to retain control in the teeth of a wrong policy. But the results of bureaucratic rule themselves influence policy. The bureaucratic mind has an essential distrust of the masses and in consequence develops the usual characteristics of bureaucracies, whatever their time or place. Specifically, the present Russian bureaucracy differs from the bourgeois bureaucracies of the capitalist countries in that the former desires to preserve the Soviet Union and the latter desire to overthrow it. Generically, however, they are identical in outlook and methods.

Decisions are taken without consulting the rank and file, and every art of lying, concealment, and repression is used to compel acceptance of the line laid down by the executive, often out of touch with the situation it is attempting to control. Further, the bureaucracy never dares to admit its mistakes, which are the more grave the more the bureaucracy considers itself infallible. The most glaring instance of this refusal to admit mistakes is afforded by the German debacle.

The Communist-International line there was tragically wrong, declared Trotski, and many of the ablest Communist leaders recognize this. It led the German workers to certain and frequently predicted disaster. Yet, immediately after the disaster, the Communist International solemnly declared that its line had been correct.

This same distrust of the masses was revealed throughout the history of the Anglo-Russian Committee, when the Communist International recognized as the representatives of the British workers the trade-union bureaucracy, even during the actual days of their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

betrayal of the General Strike of 1926—and, worse still, after it. Bureaucratic distrust was shown in the Communist International's terrible mishandling of the Chinese revolution, when they placed it under the direction of the bourgeois Kuomintang, which, as Trotski had foretold, soon after betrayed it with massacre and torture.

Bureaucratic distrust is shown repeatedly, continued Trotski, in the Communist International's attitude to other organizations, where, despite the slogan of 'united front from below,' the aim has been not so much to mobilize the revolutionary workers as to capture the organizational apparatus. All this, reinforced by the financial control of the Communist-International bureaucracy over its national sections, breeds a mentality of dependence, of unquestioning obedience, which is the very antithesis of the critical and independent mind required for a revolutionary.

III

'What were the Comintern errors in Germany?' I interpolated.

'The mistakes have continued for ten years: missing the revolutionary situation in 1923 (the occupation of the Ruhr); steering a course to armed uprising after the relationship of forces had radically changed against the proletariat; a turn toward "courting" Social Democracy (1926–1927); a new turn toward adventurism ("third period," conquest of the streets, and so on); a radically false policy with regard to the trade unions; the replacement of educational work by "ultimatism"; the creation of tiny parallel trade unions—that is, the isolation of the party from the class; the theory of social Fascism and the renunciation of the policy of the united front; nationalistic agitation and the adaptation to Fascism ("national liberation" of Germany, the participation in the Prussian plebiscite together with the Nazis); systematic destruction of all defense organizations established by local workers' organizations.

'Social Democracy and Fascism are not twins, as the Communist International declared,' insisted Trotski. 'True, Social Democracy supports the bourgeoisie, but it does not (despite treacherous leaders) support Fascism, whose victory signifies the extermination of Social Democracy as a party.'

'What are your chief criticisms of the present policy of the Communist International?' I asked.

'Chiefly, the theory of "Socialism in one country" and its resultant policy of "centrism."' Trotski defined centrism as the sum total of all the tendencies between Marxism and reformism that move from one to the other. The Communist-International bureaucracy is predisposed to become reformist but cannot do so because it is tied to the Soviet State. Yet it can not be revolutionary because it has abandoned the theory of world revolution. So it swings between the two poles and remains centrist.

'Secondly, the theory of "Socialism in one country" is not an abstract principle but a matter of life and death. The present crisis in capitalism arises not only from the contradiction between productive forces and private property but also from that between productive forces and national states. The task of Socialism is not to push back the productive forces within the boundaries of a single state but, on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the contrary, to organize them on a world scale. And this presupposes the world revolution, which ought to be the basis of the Comintern.'

This is not incompatible with the rapid industrialization of Russia. It was Trotski who in 1923 was pleading in speech and writing for a five-year plan, when Stalin was deriding him as an optimist. When the bureaucracy was at length converted to this optimism, they swung into the opposite extreme and fell into the error of 'Socialism in one country.'

IV

'Do you support the proposal for an industrial and transport boycott of Fascist Germany at the earliest possible moment?'

'Yes, at the earliest suitable moment; it is only a question of capacity.'

'At the Paris Conference,' I said, 'the Independent Labor Party urged an amendment calling for a protest or demonstration strike of definite and limited duration with regard to some special Nazi outrage, but this was rejected.'

'This time the Independent Labor Party line was the perfectly correct revolutionary policy,' replied Trotski.

Next I asked: 'Why do you despair of the Comintern's correcting its policy?'

'First, because there is no democracy within the party, and critics who attempt to correct its line are expelled. Secondly, this fight is not of recent origin: it started ten years ago. The crucial instance is Germany. If that cannot convince the bureaucracy of its errors, then nothing can. And if the Independent Labor Party is still to wait hopefully a little longer, how much longer will you wait, and what evidence will finally satisfy you? The destruction of the now endangered Soviets would surely be too high a price for the enlightenment of the Independent Labor Party.'

'What do you think must be done?'

'Form the Fourth International,' said Trotski, 'to include all revolutionaries who accept the principles of Marx and Lenin and know that the Second and Third Internationals are both bankrupt—the one through reactionary reformism and the other through bureaucratic centrism. We of the international Left opposition are ready, however, to make a united front with the Comintern bureaucracy for the specific purpose of defending the Soviet Union.'

'And what is your advice to the Independent Labor Party?'

'To remain independent at all costs, until it has completed its movement from reformism to revolution, from an empirical to a theoretical basis. You require a firm grasp of the revolutionary theory of the capitalist state, a correct evaluation of social and economic forces, adequate information of the movement of revolution and reaction outside Great Britain, and a definite plan of the revolutionary course within Britain—a plan flexible in detail but rigid in principle.'

Regretfully we took our leave to catch the night train to Paris. More than once we turned back to salute the erect figure of the former Red Army leader, who stood waving repeated farewells. While not prepared to accept all his conclusions, we were glad to have heard his own statement of his case. So, too, we believe, will be the majority of revolutionary Socialists in Britain.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II. Bankrupt Trotski

By L. Magyar

Translated from *Unsere Zeit*, Prague Communist Monthly

THE proletariat on its path to ultimate victory undergoes trials, failures, and, frequently, defeats. 'Often a defeat has a greater revolutionary consequence than an easy victory,' Marx tells us. But Trotski has tried to gain political advantage from the unavoidable failures and temporary defeats of the proletariat on its way to ultimate victory. He wants to found a new International, the Fourth International. He announces that in the West the task of the proletariat is to struggle in behalf of bourgeois democracy. He announces that in the East the task of the proletariat is to fight for democracy, for bourgeois democracy. There is only one country in which he advocates an uprising, and that country is the Soviet Union.

It is clear to us that Trotski is no Bolshevist, no Leninist: even in Lenin's lifetime Trotski openly opposed Lenin's policy. After 1923 he fought Bolshevist policy and tried to form factions inside Bolshevism. In 1927 Trotskiism ceased to be a faction of Communism. He tried to form groups of his own in every country. He failed in this effort and always will. Trotskiite groups collapsed before they even took shape. In no country has Trotski succeeded in bringing any groups of workers under his influence. To-day he hopes that Hitler's victory in Germany will help in the construction of Trotskiite groups, and perhaps he will succeed in picking up a little loot on the battlefield of the class war.

What is historic Trotskiism and how does it differ from Bolshevism? The differences between Trotski's doctrine and Lenin's became evident as long ago as 1904 in their estimations of the character and driving force of the Russian Revolution. The Menshevists proclaimed that the revolution would be a bourgeois revolution led by the bourgeoisie. The Bolshevists maintained that it would be a bourgeois-democratic revolution but that it could triumph only under the leadership of the proletariat, and that the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants would grow into a proletarian uprising. Trotski maintained that the revolution would be proletarian and expounded the theory of 'permanent revolution,' which the Bolshevists also supported, though they did not want to skip over any of the necessary stages and maintained that the bourgeois-democratic revolution would be victorious only if it were carried out by an alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry under the leadership of the proletariat. Trotski underestimated the revolutionary potentialities of the peasantry and regarded it as a counter-revolutionary force, which would inevitably come into conflict with the proletariat after victory.

Trotski's doctrine differs from Lenin's in its attitude toward opportunism. Trotski's doctrine is a form of Menshevism, of opportunism, and that is why he attached such importance to opportunist elements in the working class. To Trotski the Men-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shevists were erring brothers and not agents of the class enemy in the camp of the proletariat. Bolshevism, on the other hand, regarded the opportunist as the agent of the bourgeoisie in the ranks of the working class and the chief social support of imperialism. In the vital matters of party organization, Trotski never understood what a Bolshevist Party really is. He advocated the legalization of groups and factions within the Party and never understood that Bolshevism represents a new type, the Communist vanguard of the proletariat. Trotski regarded the Party as a Noah's Ark of tendencies, groups, and factions, and not as a homogeneous whole, democratically centralized with iron discipline.

II

Trotski took over his theory of imperialism from Kautsky. He believed in 'ultra-imperialism,' which led him from the theory of 'organized capitalism' to the idea of economic democracy. Trotski opposed and still opposes the fundamental law of imperialism, the law of unequal development, and denies that the law of unequal development is what makes imperialism possible and that it is possible for the proletariat to seize power in one country and proceed to build socialism there. Trotski's counter-revolutionary theory is based on the fact that he believes that the Russian Revolution is doomed to disaster and defeat unless the world revolution comes to its aid in time. Trotski opposes the construction of socialism in one country, hiding behind pseudo-radical phrases about world revolution. This indicates disbelief in the inner power of the Russian Revolution.

But these important features of Trotskiism do not exhaust the subject. During the World War, Trotski supported the false, non-proletarian, half-pacifistic slogan of 'peace without annexation or indemnities,' which put him in the same camp with Wilson. The Bolshevists, with Lenin at their head, advocated changing the imperialist war into civil war. Trotski opposed this view. The Bolshevists, with Lenin at their head, advocated the federation of socialist republics that were to emerge from the revolution. Trotski sounded the counter-revolutionary slogan of the United States of Europe. At every great turn of the class war Trotskiism was opposed to Leninism. Only on the eve of the October Revolution had it joined forces with Communism.

Before the War, Trotski put forward the anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist theory of the so-called great cycles. This theory asserts that capitalism not only moves in industrial cycles and oscillates between prosperity and crisis, as Marx maintained, but that capitalist production moves in larger cycles that last from twenty to thirty years. According to this theory, there is a long period of increasing stock-market prosperity during which various industrial cycles develop, culminating in a great decline. Trotski believes that the big decline began in 1914, and, in pursuance of this idea, the period of declining business activity had to be followed by a long period of increased activity.

This means the denial of the general crisis of capitalism and leads Trotski to conclude that the proletariat is doomed to a long period of defeat. Without this bourgeois theory it would be difficult to understand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trotski's present attitude. He does not believe in the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism but in a long slowly rising curve of business activity. Nor does he look forward to a new period of wars and revolutions but to a long period of capitalist stability. That is the theoretical, economic position of Trotski, and from this historical theory arises his traitorous attitude of defeat.

In the period of reaction that followed the Russian Revolution of 1905–6, the Bolshevists believed in the inevitability of a new revolution and therefore advocated Lenin's three demands during the period of reaction —a republic, confiscation of the property of the big landowners, and the eight-hour day. Trotski opposed these demands and merely advocated freedom to form coalitions.

III

To-day we see the resurrection of Trotski's demand under quite different historical conditions. The proletariat has one-sixth of the earth's surface in its hands. Elsewhere in the capitalist countries the proletariat has not yet been able to attain power. A growing wave of Fascism has now set in and has won a temporary victory in Germany. The Second International speaks of a 'counter-revolutionary situation,' Trotski of a 'period of blackest reaction.' Defeatists speak of a period of Fascism and reaction. The Bolshevists speak of an inevitable retreat before a new sequence of revolutions and wars. Is n't this the same fight under different historical conditions as the fight between Trotskiism and Leninism in the period of reaction?

Before the War the Bolshevists broke loose from the Menshevists for good and all and set themselves up as the party of the revolutionary proletariat. During this struggle Trotski attacked Lenin and the Bolshevists as disrupters, fanatics, intellectuals, and betrayers of the labor movement. In order to fight his opponents more successfully Trotski formed the so-called 'August Bloc' in Vienna in 1912. This was composed of all groups hostile to Bolshevism and was set up as a counterweight to the Prague Conference of the Bolshevist Party. He gathered about him all the opportunists, all the traitorous Menshevist elements, and made them into a single unit in order to attack the Bolshevist position. To-day, under quite different historical conditions, Trotski continues his historic treason to the working class. Trotski wishes to form a new 'August Bloc' in which he will gather together all the elements that have been thrown out of the Communist camp. He wants to form these elements into a single unit in order to struggle more successfully against Bolshevism.

The historic origins of this effort can be detected in the foregoing description of Trotski's attitude toward Menshevism. Trotskiism did not regard Menshevism as an agent of the bourgeoisie, because it was itself a part of Menshevism. Trotski always regarded the Menshevists as erring brothers who could be led back to the true path of class war by means of good advice. This attitude explains why to-day Trotski rails against the Bolshevists for calling the Social Democrats Social Fascists. Trotski speaks of forming a Fourth International, but this Fourth International is merely the recreation of the 'August Bloc' on a higher historical level.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To-day Trotskiism has become a counter-revolutionary influence. We need only refer to some of Trotski's most important prophecies to understand his true rôle. Trotski prophesied the victory of the Thermidor in the Soviet Union and attacked the Bolshevists for sacrificing the interests of the proletariat to the class interests of the kulaks. Instead of the victory of the Thermidor, socialism triumphed in the Soviet Union. The kulaks were liquidated as a class, and agriculture was collectivized.

Trotski described the first Five-year Plan as an adventure and a piece of bureaucratic fantasy. The first Five-year Plan has been fulfilled. Trotski prophesied the imminent collapse of the Chinese Revolution and a long period of stabilization under Chiang Kai-shek, but the Kuomintang has collapsed and China is in a national crisis.

When Japanese imperialism set out on its campaign against the Chinese people, the Chinese Communists raised the slogan of national revolutionary war. Trotski opposed this slogan and thus served the objective interests of Japan. Trotski described the Red Army of the Chinese Soviets as an army of pauperized peasants and bandits, thus taking the same view as Vandervelde, leader of the Second International, but the Red Army of Chinese workers and peasants advances the Soviet cause to victory.

Trotski announced that the German Communist Party was dead after Hitler's victory, but the German Communist Party is leading the heroic struggle against Hitler's Fascism. Trotski has described the leading members of the Communist International as 'Stalin bureaucrats,' but Dimitroff and hundreds of thousands of others have already shown that the 'Stalin bureaucrats' are the incarnation of the proletarian revolution.

Trotski has urged that power be forcibly removed from the Bolshevists in the Soviet Union. He advocates armed uprising at the very moment when Japanese imperialism, German Fascism, and British imperialism are preparing a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union. Trotski's doctrines to-day cannot be reconciled with historic Trotskiism. Trotski to-day is aiding the Second International and is, therefore, hand in glove with the bourgeoisie. He stands in the advance guard of the counter-revolutionary struggle against Leninism. That is why Trotskiism has been read out of the revolutionary labor movement. The Menshevists now praise him, and Schiffrin has stated that Trotski is on the right track at last but urges him to curb his attacks on the Soviet Union. The Menshevist, Schiffrin, advises Trotski not to attack the Soviet Union so openly. Trotski now belongs to a group of marauders and hyenas on the battlefield of the class struggle. He wishes to turn the temporary defeats of the proletariat to his advantage. That is why he can find no place in the ranks of the revolutionary workers. His place is on the other side.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This first published story by a young Russian writer describes a typical episode that occurred during the Polish invasion of Soviet territory in 1920.

The Soldier MOTHER

By VASSILI GROSSMAN

Translated from *Literaturnaia Gazeta*
Moscow Literary Paper

IT WAS strange to see the dark, wind-burned face of Vavilova redden. 'What are you laughing at?' she finally said. 'It's silly.'

Koziriov took a piece of paper from the table, looked at it, and burst out laughing again. 'No, really it's too much,' he said, still laughing. 'A report . . . of the commissar of the first battalion . . . forty days' leave on account of pregnancy.' Suddenly he became serious. 'Well, who would it be if not you? Not Perelmuter from the political division.'

'Perelmuter is a staunch Communist,' Vavilova said.

'You are all staunch Communists,' Koziriov mumbled and, lowering his voice as if speaking of something shameful, asked, 'And is it soon, Clavdia, that you will be giving birth?'

'Soon,' Vavilova answered. 'I would have gotten rid of it, but I let things go. You know how it is. Under the command of Grubeshov I did n't get off my horse for three months, and when I came to the hospital the doctor refused to do anything about it.' She snuffled as if she were going to cry. 'I threatened him with my bayonet, the rascal, but he refused and said it was too late.'

She went away, and Koziriov looked over the report. 'Well, there's Vavilova for you,' he thought. 'To look at her you'd hardly think she was a woman, with her Mauser gun and leather breeches. More than once she has led the battalion in attack. And even her voice is n't the voice of a woman. But in the end nature will have its way.'

All at once he felt annoyed and a little bit sad. He wrote on the report, 'To the Administration,' and with pen point raised sat wondering how he was to put it. 'That a forty day leave be granted from such and such a date.' He thought a minute and added, 'On account of sickness.' Then he scribbled in above the line, 'On account of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feminine sickness.' Finally he swore, crossed out what he had written in, and muttered, 'A fine lot of soldiers!' Then shouted to the orderly, 'But Vavilova's one of us, is n't she? Well, did you hear me?'

'I heard you,' answered the orderly, shaking his head and spitting.

Together they pronounced judgment on Vavilova in particular and on women in general, made a few obscene remarks, laughed, and Koziriov called for the division commander. 'We'll have to see about her to-morrow, I suppose, so you'd better find out whether she's in an apartment or a hospital and how things are going,' he said.

They spent the night with the division commander, and their words were few. It was the summer of 1920. The Poles were marching.

II

Vavilova moved into the room that had been requisitioned for her benefit in the town of Berdichev. The house stood on the market-place and belonged to Chaim-Abram Leibovich Magazanik, whom the neighbors and even his own wife called Chaim Tuter, which means 'the Tatar.'

Vavilova arrived with great commotion. An assistant of the Communist bureau brought her, a thin boy in a leather jacket. Magazanik cursed him out in Jewish, but the boy merely shrugged his shoulders and said nothing. Finally Magazanik resorted to Russian. 'The nerve of these rascals,' he shouted to Vavilova, as though she were supposed to take sides with him. 'What they don't think up! Just as though there were n't any more bourgeois in the town and only one room were at the disposal of the Soviet power, the room of poor Magazanik! The Soviet power had to take a room from a poor worker with seven children. And how about Litvak, the grocer, and Khodorov, the haberdasher?'

The little Magazanik children stood around, seven ragged curly-headed angels; they looked at Vavilova with their dark eyes. She was as large as a house and twice as tall as their father. They were frightened, amused, and very interested. Finally Magazanik was brushed aside, and Vavilova could enter the room. From the buffet, from the bed covers as dark and as old as the grandmothers to whom they had been given as dowries, from the chairs with gaping wounds and punctured seats, so suffocating a breath blew over her that she gasped like a swimmer before going under water.

That night she could n't sleep: on the other side of the wall an orchestra with many instruments was playing. It included everything from the shivering double bass to the thin flute—the Magazanik family was snoring. The heavy summer night, the thick smells crushed her. And what smells there were in that room! Kerosene, garlic, perspiration, goose fat, unwashed linen—the quintessence of human living.

And all the while she could feel the living creature within her, kicking its heels and turning. She had fought with it honestly, stubbornly for many months. She had jumped down from her horse and landed as heavily as she could. She had lifted heavy weights. She had drunk mystic herbs in the villages. She had bought so much iodine from the army drugstore that the pharmacist was ready to send

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a complaint to headquarters. She had taken such hot baths that she was almost blistered. But it grew steadily, hampering her in riding horseback, and she felt sick and drawn to the earth.

At first she blamed it all on that one, sad, silent man who had turned out to be stronger than she. She remembered his death and saw the Polish machine gun splutter. It seemed as though he had disappeared into thin air: his empty coat threw up its sleeves, fell, and remained hanging over the river. She galloped after him on her young colt, and behind her, almost pushing her, came the battalion. After that, It remained. The fault belonged to It alone. Now Vavilova lay conquered, and the conqueror within her was kicking its heels.

In the morning, when Magazanik was getting ready to go to work and his wife was giving him breakfast, chasing away the flies, the children, and the cat, he turned toward the requisitioned room and quietly said, 'Give her tea, and may the cholera take her.' He bathed in the sunny clouds of smoke, of smells, of childish laughter and cats' miaowing. He hated to go to work, for he loved his wife, and his children, and his old mother. He loved his house. He sighed and went out, and only the women and children remained.

All day long the pot was boiling in the market-place. Mujiks were selling birchwood that looked almost whitewashed; peasant women dangled strings of onions; Jewish grandmothers sat beside feathery hills of geese that had their legs tied together. The seller would raise the pile of fluff with snake-like neck, and the buyer would blow on the tender feathers and pinch the yellow skin. Dark ragged girls in bright colors carried tall red pots filled to the brim with strawberries and looked at the buyers with frightened eyes, as though ready to run away.

A blind beggar with the white beard of a magician prayed and cried in a tragic voice. But his terrible grief moved no one. A woman tore off the smallest onion she could find on her string and threw it into the old man's tin plate. He felt it and, stopping in the middle of his prayer, angrily said, 'May your children treat you likewise when you are old,' and again he fell to whining a prayer as old as the Jewish race. People were selling, buying, pinching, and appraising. They raised thoughtful eyes to Heaven as though hoping that something would come down from the gentle blue sky and advise them whether to buy the pike or the carp. Everyone was shouting and cursing and living.

Vavilova fixed the room and swept the floor. She put away her coat, her fur-lined hat, and her shoes. Her head was bursting with the noise from the street, and the apartment was full of the cries of the little Tuters. She felt as though she were dreaming, a heavy strange dream.

Coming back from work in the evening, Magazanik stopped in surprise at the door. His wife, Bela, was sitting at the table, and by her side was a large woman in a loose flowing gown. They were laughing softly, whispering to one another and measuring tiny infant's underwear with their big fat hands. During the day Bela had walked into Vavilova's room while the latter stood by the window. Bela's sharp eye had noticed Va-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vilova's size, which even her height could not hide. 'I beg your pardon,' Bela had said in a positive tone, 'but it seems to me that you are pregnant.' Raising her hands to Heaven, laughing, and sermonizing, she began bustling about. 'Children,' she said, 'are such a misfortune. I am sure you have no idea of it. So much trouble, so much worry—every day they want to eat, and a week does n't go by without one of them having a rash and another having a fever. And Dr. Baraban—God give him health—takes ten pounds of flour for every call.' She patted little Sonia on the head. 'And still they go on living. Not one of them has died.'

III

It turned out that Vavilova knew nothing and was utterly helpless. She immediately bowed down before Bela's superior knowledge. She listened, asked questions, and Bela, chortling with joy at the idea that a commissar could be so ignorant, told her everything: how to feed babies, how to bathe them, what to do to keep them from crying at night, how many diapers to have on hand, how newborn babies suffocate with crying and get so purple that one feels their heart will burst, what causes rashes, and so forth. It was a strange new world with its own laws and customs, its own joys and sorrows. 'Get away from my feet,' she shouted to the children, 'and go out into the yard.' And when the room was quiet again Bela lowered her voice and started to talk of childbirth. 'Oh, that's no simple thing.'

Bela, like an old soldier, told the new recruit of the great sufferings and joys of childbirth. 'You probably think that it's very simple, just like war. Bing, bang, and it's all over. Well, no, my darling. It's not as simple as that.'

Vavilova listened. For the first time in all those months she met a person who did not sympathize with her in her misfortune but spoke of it, 'this accidental annoyance,' as of a happy event.

In the evening Tuter joined the conversation. There was no time to lose. After supper, armed with a candle, he hastened to the garret and, with a crash and a rumbling, brought down a metal crib and bath for the benefit of the newcomer.

'You may rest assured, Comrade Commissar,' he said with a twinkle in his eye, 'in our house we are no novices at the trade.'

'Keep still,' his wife muttered. 'It is n't for nothing that people call you the Tatar.'

That night, as Vavilova lay in bed, the heavy smells did n't oppress her as much as they had before. She had become accustomed to them and scarcely noticed anything. All thought had vanished. It seemed to her that somewhere horses were neighing, and before her eyes a whole row of red-brown horse heads flickered: each horse had a white spot on its forehead. The heads were constantly moving, and tossing, and showing their teeth. She thought of the battalion and remembered Kierpechev, an officer of the second division. A lull at the front: who will discuss the July days? The factory is to be called to task for not having delivered the boots on time. And the cloth for puttees—we can cut that ourselves. There are lots of discontented people in the second division, especially that curly-headed boy who is forever singing the songs of the Don

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

River. Vavilova yawned and closed her eyes. The battalion went far, far away down the pink corridors of dawn between the damp mounds of hay. And her thoughts seemed unreal.

It was kicking its heels impatiently. Vavilova opened her eyes and raised herself on her elbow. 'Is it a girl or a boy?' she asked aloud and suddenly felt her heart expanding.

IV

Labor began at noon, and Bela took Vavilova to bed. Sema cheerfully ran to get the midwife. Vavilova held Bela's hand and spoke rapidly. 'It's begun, Bela. And I thought it would n't be for another ten days.'

Then the pain went away, and Vavilova decided that they had disturbed the midwife for nothing. But in half an hour it began again. Vavilova's face turned quite dark, and the sunburn lay like paint that had been put on carelessly. The children kept looking into the room, and the blind grandmother heated water on the stove. Bela kept looking at the door; the expression of sadness on Vavilova's face frightened her.

Finally the midwife came. They called her Rosalia Samoilovna. Her hair was bobbed, she was stocky, her face was red, and at once the house was filled with her strident voice. She shouted at Bela, at the children, at the old grandmother. Everything began moving around her. The stove in the kitchen began to purr. The chairs and the table disappeared from the room, and Bela washed the floor quickly, as though trying to put out a fire. Rosalia Samoilovna was chasing the flies out with a wet towel. Vavilova looked at her and thought that the commander-in-chief had arrived. He, too, was stocky, red-cheeked, and loud-mouthed, and he always came when a breach had been made in the front line. On such occasions everyone cast shy glances about and whispered as though some comrade lay dead or seriously sick, until the commander would rip apart this veil of secrecy and quiet with shouts, oaths, orders, and laughter, as though he cared nothing about the surrounded regiments.

Vavilova was overwhelmed by Rosalia Samoilovna's powerful voice and did everything as she was told. At times she would almost lose consciousness and think that the walls and ceiling had lost all definite contours and were about to collapse. But she was brought back to consciousness by the midwife's loud voice and again saw the red sweaty face with the white ends of the kerchief about the woman's neck. She did n't think of anything. She felt as though her bones were cracking and breaking. But she did not cry; she gritted her teeth and took deep breaths of air. At times the pain would go away so completely that she was surprised. She would look around and listen to the noise of the market-place. The glass of water on the stool by her bed surprised her. It was strange that there were pictures on the wall. But when the child would try once again to come into the world, she felt the terror of birth pangs and a vague sort of joy: 'Let it come quickly, it is unavoidable now,' she thought.

Rosalia Samoilovna whispered to Bela, 'If you think that I'd wish myself to be in childbirth for the first time at the age of thirty-six you're greatly mistaken.'

Vavilova did not hear what she

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said, but she was terrified because the midwife spoke quietly. 'Well, don't you think I'll live?' But she did not hear Rosalia Samoilovna's answer.

Bela stood at the door, shrugged her shoulders, and said, 'Well, what's it all for, anyhow? Who needs all this suffering? Neither she, nor the child, nor its father—may he perish. Nor God in heaven. Who was the wise guy who thought this up?'

Childbirth went on for many hours. Magazanik came home and sat on the porch steps. He was as worried as if Bela had been giving birth. Night descended. Lights appeared in the windows. The Jews were coming back from the synagogue with their prayer robes rolled tightly under their arms. By moonlight the market-place and the little houses on the streets seemed lovely and secret. Cavalry officers, their spurs clicking, walked along the sidewalks. Girls munched sunflower seeds, laughed, and looked at the Red officers. One of them said, 'And I threw bits of paper at him, I did.'

'Well,' Magazanik mused, 'I don't have enough of my own, I suppose, so the whole brigade has to give birth in my house.' He suddenly rose. From behind the door a man's voice could be heard. The voice was shouting out such powerful words that Magazanik, listening, shook his head and spat. It was Vavilova, maddened by the pain of the last birth pangs, challenging God for her miserable fate.

'I can understand it,' Magazanik said, 'I can understand it well. It's the Commissar giving birth, but Bela can say only one thing—"Mother, mother, mother mine."'

Rosalia Samoilovna bathed the newborn baby and announced, 'It's a boy.'

'What did I tell you?' Bela solemnly said, and, opening the door, shouted victoriously, 'Chaim, the child, a boy!'

And the whole family gathered at the door, talking nervously. Even the blind grandmother crept up and smiled at the great miracle. Her lips trembled, her head shook, and her lifeless hands plucked at her black shawl. She smiled and whispered soundlessly. The children pushed her away from the door, but she craned her neck and tried to get in. She wanted to hear the voice of ever-conquering life.

Vavilova looked at the newborn baby. She was amazed to think that such a tiny ball of reddish-blue flesh could be the cause of so much suffering. She thought that her child would be big, freckled, pug-nosed, and red-headed, that he would begin immediately to shout and tear about. But he was as weak as a sprout of oats that had grown in a cellar. His head would n't hold up, and the curved legs jiggled. The blue eyes could not see, and his cry was barely audible. If anyone opened the door suddenly, it seemed as though he must go out like the candle that Bela had stuck on the edge of the commode. And although the room was as hot as a Turkish bath, she stretched out her arms and said, 'He is cold, give him to me.' The baby whimpered. Vavilova, narrowing her eyes, afraid to move, followed him with her eyes. 'Oh, oh, my little son,' she said and began to cry.

At first she cried about the man who had been killed in battle: he would never see his son. And that little one who had been born without a father she covered with a blanket, so that he would n't be cold. And

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maybe she cried for an entirely different reason. At any rate, Rosalia Samoilovna, lighting a cigarette and blowing the smoke out the window, said, 'Let her cry, it's better for the nerves than bromides.'

V

On the third day following, Vavilova got out of bed. She felt her strength coming back to her very quickly. She walked a lot. She helped Bela with the housework. When no one was at home she sang to her child. They called him Aliosha, Alioshenka.

'You should see her,' Bela whispered to her husband. 'The woman's gone clear out of her mind. She's taken him to the doctor three times. You can't open a door in the house: he might catch cold, he might wake up, he might get a fever. Just like a good Jewish mother.'

'Well, what do you think?' Magazanik answered. 'Does a woman turn into a man just because she wears leather breeches?' He shrugged his shoulders and half-closed his eyes.

A week later Koziriov and the chief of staff came to visit Vavilova. They smelled of leather, tobacco, and horse sweat. Aliosha was sleeping in his crib, protected from flies by a piece of gauze. Squeaking loudly like two new shoes, they walked up to the crib and looked at the sleeping child. His face trembled in his sleep. It was simply the natural movement of the skin, but it gave him a great variety of expressions—sorrow, and anger, and happiness. The soldiers looked at each other.

'Yes,' Koziriov said.

'Yes, indeed,' the chief of staff replied.

They sat down and began to talk. 'The Poles have begun attacking . . . Some of our troops are in retreat . . . That, of course, is temporary. . . . The fourteenth army is gathering . . . Some divisions are coming from the Urals . . . The Ukraine will be ours . . . In a month there will be a break . . . But meantime the Poles are coming down thick . . .' Koziriov swore.

'Quiet,' Vavilova said. 'Don't shout or you'll wake him up.'

'Yes, our face is covered with blood,' the chief of staff murmured and laughed.

'You're always saying the same thing,' Vavilova said and sorrowfully added, 'If you only would n't smoke like a chimney.'

All at once the soldiers felt bored. Koziriov yawned. The chief of staff looked at his watch and said, 'Let's not be late getting to the Bald Mountain.'

'But his watch is gold,' Vavilova thought with irritation.

'Well, let's say good-by, Clavdia,' Koziriov said, rising. 'I ordered a bag of flour for you. Also some sugar and lard. They'll bring it over to-day.'

They went out into the street. All the little Magazaniks were gathered about the horses. Koziriov hauled himself into the saddle with a groan. The chief of staff clicked his tongue and jumped onto the horse. At the corner they both stopped, as though they had agreed upon it in advance.

'Yes,' said Koziriov.

'Yes, indeed,' the chief of staff replied.

They burst out laughing, whipped up their horses, and were off.

In the evening the provisions arrived. Dragging the bag into the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

house Magazanik went into Vavilova's room and said in a secretive tone, 'I don't know how you'll like the news, Comrade Vavilova, but the brother-in-law of the Tsessarski burgomaster came into our workshop.' He looked around and, as though apologizing before Vavilova, said with surprise, 'The Poles are in Chudnov, and Chudnov is forty miles from here.'

Bela came. She listened to her husband's war philosophy and said decisively, 'What's the use of talking. To-morrow the Poles will be here. But this much I want to say: Poles or no Poles, Austrians or Galicians, you can stay in our house. Thank God you have enough food to last over three months.'

Vavilova was silent. For the first time in her life she did n't know what to do. 'Bela,' she whispered, and was silent again.

—'I'm not afraid,' Bela replied. 'Do you think I am? Leave me five such ones and it would n't frighten me. But where in the world did you see a mother who would leave her child when he was a week and a half old?'

All night you could hear the horses neighing outside the window, the clatter of wheels, the turmoil, the angry voices. The baggage trains were coming from Shepetovka to Kazatin. Vavilova sat by the crib. The child was sleeping. She looked at the yellowish face. There was n't anything extraordinary about it, all told. Koziriov said that they would be back in a month. Just exactly the time that she had planned to spend on leave. And what if they should be cut off for a long time? Well, even that did n't frighten her. When Aliosha is a little stronger she would be able to get through the front line. Who would harm them, a peasant woman with a child at her breast? Vavilova imagined herself walking through the fields on an early summer morning, a bright handkerchief tied about her head, and Aliosha looking at everything and stretching out his little hands. It was good indeed, and she sang in her thin voice, 'Sleep, my little one, sleep.' Rocking the cradle, she dozed off.

VI

In the morning the market was awake as usual. The people were aroused. Some of them looked at the continuous stream of war trains and laughed with joy, rubbing their hands. The baggage had arrived. People filled the streets. At the gates were the 'inhabitants of the settlements,' as the commanding officers always called them. Everyone was talking to everyone else and looking around. They said that the Poles had already taken the Piatka village fifteen versts away. Magazanik did n't go to work. He sat in Vavilova's room philosophizing. An automobile rolled by in the direction of the station. It was covered with a thick layer of dust, and it looked as if it were weary with fatigue and long sleepless nights.

'To tell you the truth,' Magazanik said, 'this is really the best time for people. One power has fallen and the other has not yet arisen. No requisitions, no taxes, no pogroms.'

'He is clever that way in the daytime,' Bela said. 'But when, at night, the whole town yells for help because the bandits are here he sits as pale as death and trembles with fear.'

'Can't you let a man talk?' Magazanik lost his temper.

He kept running out into the street

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and coming back with news. The revolutionary committee had evacuated during the night, the governing committee had followed, the staff had gone away. The station was empty. Everyone had left. All of a sudden cries were heard in the streets. An airplane passed over the city. Vavilova went to the window. The airplane was flying high, but one could see quite plainly the red and white circles on the wings. It was the Polish reconnoissance.

The airplane flew around the city toward the railroad station, and then from the direction of the Bald Mountain cannons began firing. Shells whizzed over the town. From some far-away railroad crossing came the sound of explosions. At first the projectiles whizzed by like a hurricane. Then the guns sighed heavily; and after a few seconds the explosions burst forth with renewed joy. The Bolshevists were checking the march of the Poles. Soon the Poles answered. Shells hit the town in several places. The air broke with a crash. Bricks were pulverized to dust, and smoke played over the shattered walls. The streets became quiet, austere, empty, just like the streets in pictures. After each explosion there was such silence that one's heart stood still. The sun shone down from a cloudless sky, and the town was illuminated like a corpse laid out in state.

The entire population had gone down into the cellars and groaned with fear. Everyone closed his eyes and held his breath. Everyone knew, even the children, that the bombing was called the 'preparation of the artillery' and that before occupying the town the attacking army would send out several dozen more shells; and everyone knew that all would be quiet again until suddenly horses would clatter down the broad streets.

That will be the 'cavalry investigation.' Half dead with fear and curiosity, everyone will look out through the gates, the curtains, and begin to creep out into the yard. The detachment will ride out to the main square. The horses will snort. The exhilarated riders will shout at each other in their ordinary plain human language, while their leader, joyful at his conquest, will bawl drunkenly, shoot his revolver into the quiet air, and draw up his horse, forcing it to stand on its hind legs. Then from all sides, on foot and on horseback, the squadrons will pour in. Dusty weary people will run into the houses, good-natured but capable of murder. Everyone knew this, for the town had been invaded fourteen times and had been in the possession of Petlura, the Lenin troops, the Galicians, the Poles, the bands of Tutunik, and the ninth regiment of 'beggars,' and each time was like the one before.

'They are singing,' Magazanik shouted, 'they are singing.' And, forgetting his fear, he ran out on the porch.

Vavilova followed him. After the heavy darkness of the room, she took particular joy in the light and the warm sunny day. With the same feeling that she had experienced during childbirth, she awaited the Poles: if they would only come soon. The explosions frightened her. She was afraid they might awaken Aliosha. She shooed off the whizzing shells as though they were flies. 'Come, come,' she had sung by the crib. 'You'll wake Aliosha.' She tried not to think of anything. It was all decided. Either

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Bolshevists would come in a month, or they would go across the front to join them.

'I don't understand a thing,' Magazanik said. 'Look over there.'

Along the broad empty street in the direction from which the Poles were supposed to arrive, a squadron of military students appeared. They wore white trousers and jackets. 'Let the red flag symbolize the ideals of the working class,' they sang in drawn-out and almost sad voices. They were marching against the Poles.

Vavilova followed them with her eyes. And all at once she remembered the great Red Square where several thousand volunteer workers going to the front had gathered around a hastily erected platform. A bald man, waving his cap, had made a speech. Vavilova had stood very near him. She had been so excited that she could n't understand half of what the man said. The people standing about listened, breathing deeply. An old man in a quilted coat cried. She did not know what happened to her in the Square, in the shadow of the dark walls. Once she had wanted to tell him, the silent one, her lover, about it. She thought he would understand, but it did n't work out. And, when they marched out of the square to the railroad station, they sang this song. Looking at the faces of the singing students, she lived her experience of two years ago over again.

Magazanik saw a woman running behind the students and trying to catch up with them. She was stuffing bullets into a large Mauser. Following her with his eyes, Magazanik said, 'These are real people, Bela. And what are we? Scum, that's all.'

Aliosha woke up and started to cry. He kicked his little feet and tried to crawl out of his covers.

Bela said to her husband. 'Listen, the child is awaking. Light the stove, and let's heat some milk.'

The regiment disappeared at the turn of the road.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS ABROAD

HITLER OVER EUROPE? *By Ernst Henri. London: Dent. 1934.*

(Brian Howard in the *New Statesman and Nation*, London)

FIRST of all, it must be said that this is probably the best work on the Third Reich that has appeared in English. This is so in spite of what at first seems an incompleteness in that it somewhat neglects the ideologues of the movement. The author appears to forget that there are still a number of Nazi 'idealists' who really believe in all this Nordic buncombe. But those who wish to inform themselves here can read Prince Hubertus Löwenstein, and one of the achievements of Ernst Henri's contribution is his point that these altruists are being consistently suppressed and undermined. There was never any chance for the socialist elements in National Socialism; this is now so plain that even National Socialists can see it, and many of them are at this moment abandoning enthusiasm for a thwarted discontent.

Ernst Henri's book should be read at once by everyone who is seriously interested in understanding the real bases of Hitlerism. With rare lapses—some small redundancy, a slight liability to nag, a touch, here and there, of the histrionic—the author maintains a sober and convincing tone. From numberless sources, with tireless, and almost tiring, industry, he has put together a book the great accomplishment of which is that it discloses, for the first time, the dynamics of the Nazi movement. He has written a historical work that is a profound, thorough, though not unbiased, exposition of what the Nazis really are. In one word, as he explained in the *Week-end Review*, this is Thyssenism. Thyssen, the richest of German industrial magnates, the dictator of the Ruhr, is proved, together with his group, as having become the animating force behind Hitler, and he himself is reasonably indicted as being as much of a menace as one man well can be to the peace of the world.

In his first pages, the author claims that coal and steel, more than the middle class, made the Revolution. In 1931, when the shares of the German Steel Trust (the largest industrial concern in the country), shares offered at its foundation at 125 per cent, fell to 15 per cent, the Brüning Government saved the situation by buying nearly half. But in the Ruhr there were still two groups who had always contested, at the cost of millions of marks, for the leadership of the trust. One, the Otto Wolff-Deutsche Bank group, and the other, the Thyssen-Flick-Völger group; the former, liberal, 'foreign,' Jewish, Catholic, and the latter,—the inheritors of Stinnes,—Prussian, die-hard, nationalist, 'for whom not even the Wilhelm monarchy itself was reactionary and militaristic enough.'

'Thyssen, since 1927, has been a member, the chief financier, and the real inspirer of the Hitler party. . . . He it was who already in 1929 invited Hitler to Düsseldorf, the headquarters of the Steel Trust, and there introduced him for the first time to an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assembly of 300 leading industrialists of the Ruhr. He it was who, three years later, at the beginning of 1932, brought Hitler a second time to Düsseldorf, this time in order to develop his programme for the future before 2,000 German industrialists.' It was decided, against the opposition of Wolff, that every coal and steel concern must contribute to election funds. The price of coal was forthwith raised, and for the presidential elections of 1932 Thyssen gave Hitler 3,000,000 marks. It is more than probable that, at this moment, in view of the Strasser secession and the loss of 2,000,000 votes, Hitler would have been destroyed by Schleicher. But Thyssen saved him and gained the Steel Trust and the whole Ruhr. As a reward, he becomes state councilor for West Germany, a new political office superseding all local authorities. He is absolute ruler of the heart of German heavy industry, the tract of country that 'gave birth to the first great industrial dynasties, the Krupps, the Thyssens, the Stinnes, the Haniels, the Stumms, which supported the state of William II on their shoulders. . . . It pushed forward, through the constant driving force of its coal and iron, the German mercantile fleet, German electrical engineering, the German machine industry, German chemistry, which became the leading industries of the world.'

Ernst Henri goes on to explain the future plans of the Thyssen group. He points out how the imperative necessity for economic expansion will wreck them, and their Germany with them, if it is not met, and how Hitler, who was brought into being by them for the purpose, is helping them in every way he can. By the discouragement of the Brown Shirts (the petty bourgeois) and the elevation of the Black Shirts (the upper-middle and upper class) into a capitalist bodyguard. By ceaseless drilling and arming. By the abolition of all trade unions, and the division of the 7,000,000 unemployed into 4,000,000 who are officially registered on dwindling relief and 3,000,000 'invisible unemployed.' These 3,000,000, former Socialists, Jews, and women, are simply being deprived of their means of livelihood and have disappeared from Nazi statistics. Above all, by the Rosenberg plan.

Behind the German Foreign Office there stands an organization called the 'Office for Foreign Affairs of the National-Socialist Party.' In control of this is Alfred Rosenberg, who has formulated a scheme in which the ambitions of Thyssen are disguised to perfection under the cloak of Nazi ideology. Roughly speaking, the plan is for a *bloc* under German domination from, and including, Lapland to Bulgaria and Belgium to the Ukraine. Publicly, it is to be the Germanic Racial Empire; privately, it is to be the Central European Economic Empire. 'The map is, point for point, identical with the map of the expansion of German heavy industry.' For those who find the notion of such a project fantastic, I must add that Ernst Henri's pages on the plan are crammed with documentary evidence, and that the recent quotations he gives from Hitler and Goebbels are convincing enough in themselves. The vital iron ore of Lorraine, the coal of Belgium and Holland, the steel works of Western and Central Europe (the Comité des Forges, which controls

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Schneider-Creusot and Skoda), the copper of the Balkans, avenue to eastern markets, the riches of the Ukraine —it is the old story of the acquisition of power with which to rival England, France, and America, on the one side, and Russia, on the other; it is the new form of the old imperialist German dream, the dream for which the Germans have waged war in the past and for which, on Henri's evidence, they will wage it again. It is for this that the Ruhr is proved to have bought Hitler, a man who, according to Professor von Gruber, the greatest living German authority on anthropology, is not, psychologically, a normal human being.

Much of the latter part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the methods by which, according to Henri, the fight for the plan is being everywhere carried on. It is mainly accomplished by subsidizing the Fascist parties in the countries concerned, and the business flourishes in most of them. Henri ends with an estimate of anti-Nazi forces. There were, after all, 13,000,000 old Socialists, Communists, and pacifists in Germany. Some parts of this section have been published in the *New Statesman and Nation;* those, for instance, concerned with the celebrated 'revolutionary groups of five' that were organized in most of the factories after the Revolution. The author contends that there is still to-day a substantial list of secret revolutionary units, all of which have been united, Catholics with Communists, in the anti-Fascist front.

Henri draws a final conclusion at which it is difficult to demur. Germany, sooner or later, must, as the logical outcome of every move in her internal and external politics, embark on war. A civil war may first prevent this; certainly a civil war would ensue. But he adds that what may, and can, prevent both is the vigorous inception and prosecution of a European anti-Fascist alliance on the part of all who do not welcome a second and far-more-appalling world war. We must agree with him. Utopias may lie in the future, but Fascism menaces in the present. What there is of freedom in Europe, and what there is of peace, what there is of justice, and of spiritual advancement—this may be a subject of dispute. But that there is something, and something growing, is not to be disputed. The time has now come for those who in the least value these things to band themselves together in a common defensive action on their behalf.

GOLDSWORTHY LOWES DICKINSON. *By E. M. Forster. London: Arnold. 1934.*

(Desmond MacCarthy in the *Sunday Times*, London)

IT IS a charming book, a book that few men of letters could have written and many men of all sorts will read—in time; not at once, perhaps, but in time. Clearly it was a labor of love, and in literature nothing is more difficult to accomplish thoroughly than a labor of love. The writer who writes about a friend out of his love for him, when he praises can never be sure how much he has a right to expect the public to accept, nor, when he is restrained, how stingily they may interpret reserve. But Mr. Forster is, as we know, a very subtle novelist and a man of most delicate antennæ; he has felt his way through such difficulties with imaginative tact. And at the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

end he faces confidently the *advocatus diaboli*, who speaks for anyone who asks, 'Why write a life of Lowes Dickinson?'

'If I say, "Because I want to," the answer is, "Who are you?" If I say, "My friend was beloved, affectionate, unselfish, intelligent, witty, charming, inspiring," the Devil will reply, "Yes, but that is neither here nor there, or rather it was there but it is no longer here. I have your word and the word of others that this once was so, and I do not query it, but is there nothing that will survive when all of you also have vanished?"'

Was he a great writer? He wrote well. But Mr. Forster is compelled to add, 'the words "great writer" won't do for Lowes Dickinson except in the low, laudatory sense in which all writers of distinction and integrity get called great.'

Was he then important as a thinker? He could think and in the spirit of philosophy, but he was not endowed with intellectual power necessary for original or prolonged abstract speculation. Was he a poet? He wrote a little poetry—and it was good; but, as Mr. Forster suggests elsewhere, speaking of his verse, 'it is surprising that his desire to be a poet, his honesty, his intense feeling, his musical ear, and his technical ability did not between them carry him further. But he had not the temperament that creates verses out of nothing and has produced so much worthless yet authentic stuff. He could only write in a mood of high seriousness, and there are perils in such a mood that he did not avoid. Escaping the dust, he became involved in clouds.'

You see what Mr. Forster admits. It is not Dickinson's poetry that can silence the Devil's advocate; and he, turning now from Parnassus to Pisgah, points to the Promised Land and asks, 'Has he brought *that* any nearer? What has this dreamer effected from the humanitarian point of view?' To that interrogation there is an affirmative answer, but it is a conditional one. It depends upon an 'if.' 'The one big practical thing for which Dickinson worked was a league of nations.' Before the War, much of what he wrote prepared the way for it; during the War he was the first to formulate the idea of it; after the War, for years, his intellectual energies were absorbed in supporting it. *The Choice before Us* and *The International Anarchy* are two notable blows struck on behalf of that cause, and in article and in pamphlet Dickinson struck again and again. If civilization does not die of patriotism, his name and that of Sir Norman Angell are likely to be most honored among publicists contemporary with the birth of the League of Nations. If! Ah, that exceptious particle! It looks today as though the fools might be going to have their way and that Dickinson may have worked in vain.

Well, admitting the full force of this 'if,' how then does Mr. Forster silence the Devil's advocate? What answer has he in reserve? Dickinson, he replies, was a rare human being:—

'He was an indescribably rare being, he was rare without being enigmatic, he was rare in the only direction that seems to be infinite, the direction of the *chorus mysticus*. He did not merely increase our experience; he left us more alert for what has not yet been experienced and more hopeful about other men because he had lived. And a biog-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

raphy of him; if it succeeded, would resemble him; it would achieve the unattainable, express the inexpressible, turn the passing into the everlasting. Have I done that? *Das Unbeschreibliche hier ist's getan?* No. And perhaps it could only be done through music. But that is what has lured me on.'

That is eloquent, that is felt; it states, too, something that lies diffused throughout this Life, a book that is light, intimate, and packed with facts. Still, it is not the kind of answer, though containing truth, that in my experience has much effect upon a Devil's advocate. The creature is apt merely to grin when you answer him in a glow; he grins, and waits for your glow to cool. Being familiar with *der Geist der stets verneint*, I would prefer to address him thus: 'Dickinson was indeed a rare being, one whom it was good to be near, and, if a biographer's art can bring others near to him, such a book is worth more to us than many accounts of lives that have made or have been mixed with history. You know that well. Take away the book and read it; you won't come back. But you need not even do that, for I think I can indicate now, on the spot, that Dickinson was, in a very real sense, a representative man, and to the lives of such men you never raise objection.'

LOWES DICKINSON was one of the most remarkable of the lesser writers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. His voice was not loud but distinct, and it is more likely to be audible at a distance than many more resonant contemporary voices. It had beautiful inflections; it was never overemphatic. His mind was clear and fair. He wrote not for fame but to do good; he argued not to display his intellectual muscles but to persuade. He applied his intellect to problems of the day, but in the spirit of one far more interested in ends than in means. Indeed, the drift of his work may be described as a plea for the study of ends—of what is really worth attaining—in an age chiefly concentrated in its science, economics, and politics on means and, therefore, an age in danger of forgetting the art of life. It was this art to which in dialogue and discourse, in his *Greek View of Life*, the *Magic Flute*, the *Meaning of Good*, *Letters of John Chinaman*, he returned again and again. Because the Greek and Chinese sages seemed to him to have understood it so well they were his favorite subjects of discourse. 'Our poets,' he makes John Chinaman say, 'our poets and literary men have taught their successors, for long generations, to look for good not in wealth, not in power, not in miscellaneous activity but in a trained, a choice, an exquisite appreciation of the most simple and universal relations of life. To feel, and in order to feel to express, or at least to understand the expression of all that is lovely in nature, of all that is poignant and sensitive in man, is to us in itself a sufficient end. A rose in a moonlit garden, the shadow of trees on the turf, almond bloom, scent of pine, the wine cup and the guitar—these and the pathos of life and death, the long embrace, the hand stretched out in vain, the moment that glides forever away with its freight of music and light into the shadow and hush of the haunted past, all that we have, all that eludes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

us, a bird on the wing, a perfume escaped on the gale—to all these things we are trained to respond, and the response is what we call literature.'

He aimed at bringing into social, moral, and international controversy the spirit of liberal culture; its impartiality without its aloofness, its superiority without its superciliousness. I have quoted Mr. Santayana before in this connection, and I will do so again, for I know no better brief description of what culture is: 'The man of culture abounds in discriminating sentiments; he lives under the distant influence of exalted minds; his familiar thoughts at breakfast are intimate appreciations of poetry and art; and, if his culture is really mellow, he sometimes smiles a little at his own culture.' This description fits Dickinson well, especially if we substitute for art, music; but we must also add that there was in him another equally strong impulse—a longing to be of use to his fellow men. It tortured him and was often the source of deep despondencies, for it seemed he could help so little.

Mr. Forster's careful biography brings out the persistence of this impulse: how it drove him—he, a scholar and philosopher, singularly inept with his hands and to whom the sight of suffering was intolerable—at one time to train himself as a doctor; how, too, it determined the movement of his mind away from mysticism to politics. But though he became absorbed in discussions of what should next be done, he never lost faith in culture as the ultimate means to unanimity in societies that are admittedly not unanimous. Politically and intellectually culture does not compel unity, but it seeks to make men accept their differences, agree to differ. It mistrusts force and loathes compulsion; culture is therefore the flower of liberalism. The value and the significance of Dickinson's life lay in his being a representative figure of that liberal culture that flourished in the nineteenth century and received such a shock in the War. The self-confidence of such men rested on the faith that men were rational, capable of distinguishing in the long run between prejudices and just judgments. It was in the spirit of that faith (his style shows it) that he addressed the public as a man of letters, and after the War continued to address us, keeping out of his books a despondency regarding the future, which often oppressed him. Nothing could be more impressive than the manner in which, as Mr. Forster shows, when War broke out, Dickinson sat down to fight for the end for which the War was being fought—nominally. During the first fortnight he drew up two schemes for a league of nations. Upon his initiative a committee was formed, of which Lord Bryce became a member, and came to be known as 'the Bryce group.' It foreshadowed the Covenant of the League. Then in 1915 it turned into the League of Nations Society, and on its behalf Dickinson toured America in 1916.

But these actions are not what gives this biography its value; that value lies in the subtle manner in which the author brings us, often humorously, into contact with the mind that initiated them and with Dickinson's attitude, not only toward the problems of peace and war, but toward the overmechanization of life that he saw round him and detested. We breathe in this book the atmosphere in which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alone he could think and love. Culture is the enemy of *Kultur*, for the latter denotes national possessions in custom, law, industry, arts, religion and is born of compulsory uniformity. Fascism, Communism, Hitlerism can produce only *Kultur*. There is no reason to think they are permanent; history shows they are apt to crack even when braced with force and the machinery at the disposal of society. Liberalism is not a word to conjure with just now, but it stands for something permanent in human nature, and wherever the conceptions of liberal culture are honored there the name of this gentle implacable champion of it will be honored too. Here is his portrait, finely drawn.

LES HEURES DE SILENCE. *By Robert de Traz. Paris: Grasset. 1934.*

(Edmond Jaloux in the *Nouvelles Littéraires*, Paris)

IT OFTEN happens that a long-forgotten topic suddenly takes on new intensity and clamors for solution. Such, at present, is the topic of illness, which has been dealt with in several different ways this year and which has been put before the public at large in the most general and in the most subtle manner. Illness is one of the principal themes in the work of Rainer Maria Rilke, and we find it anew in that beautiful book by Mme. Monique Saint-Hélier, *la Cage aux rêves*, which handles the question with extreme delicacy. But M. Robert de Traz has devoted an entire volume to the development of this theme.

Nothing could be more difficult for such an author as M. de Traz than to enter upon this subject. It required tact and great sensitiveness to step into the world of the sick and to bring back one's impressions without appearing to be a curious intruder. M. Robert de Traz was able to attract the good-will of the patients and not betray them in revealing it to us. His is a work written in good faith, and—better still—it is the confession of a sensitive human being who looks upon those who are sick neither as vanquished nor wounded but realizes that they have gone further along the road we are all traveling, for, no matter where we stand at present, we are inevitably bound in the direction of the greater reality. Sickness, moreover, is one of these realities, especially when it comes not as an accident but as a profound upheaval that changes the very nature of the man and paves the way to his more complete expression.

The people whom M. de Traz tells us about are the tubercular patients of Leysin. He studies the universe that they create among themselves, which is quite different from our own. He also studies certain specific cases—those that best reveal the new experience that comes with serious illness—and tries to relate these disparate phenomena to a set of general rules, the essential traits of which he has tried to bring out. These characteristics carry us back to the same idea of tuberculosis that the romantic period popularized and that has since been considered ridiculous. We see that tuberculosis often depends upon the spiritual life and that it develops under the influences of sorrow, moral shock, and worry. Turning against the spiritual state that has caused it, tuberculosis will impart to its victims an exceptional sort of intellectual or moral glamour.

M. Robert de Traz recalls the rôle

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of consumptives in the history of literature and art. The painting of Watteau is typical of a tubercular victim, so is the work of Chopin, Aubrey Beardsley, and Maurice de Guérin. Novalis, Keats, Marie Bashkirtsev, Katherine Mansfield, and Albert Samain have certain traits in common, but they are so obvious that it seems useless to dwell on them in any detail. And how many tubercular patients, even after they have been completely cured, will continue to reveal in their works a habit of mind that is typically their own. Dostoievski belongs to this group, as well as Edgar Allan Poe, whose work is a lyric manifestation of tuberculosis. Though he did not die of this sickness, both his mother and his wife did, and they were the only women he really loved.

We must quote in its entirety the wonderfully lucid page in which M. de Traz describes the special sort of dream that is common to his patients:—

'The world on whose threshold they stand—even if they do not know it, even if they are never to know it—is readily invented. They have fewer memories than plans. Saved from small failures by one general failure, overwhelmingly disillusioned rather than robbed of illusion bit by bit, they are wonderfully prepared for dreaming. Stretched out on their *chaises longues* for days without end, they create their own illusory joys and fictitious ambitions. Their possibilities are unlimited because they need never be carried into effect. No other patient is more of a dreamer. Thus tuberculosis is not so much a disintegration of the flesh as an exhaustion, a fervor, and a state of spiritual seething. The tenderest visions, the purest exaltations that have been proffered to miserable humanity have come to us as the gift of those who were ill with tuberculosis.'

M. de Traz's study, in treating a very special problem, touches on universal questions. 'They are so in need of love,' he says of his dear sick ones. '"Just like everyone else," you will reply. No, more than anyone else. First, because they are alone, and sad, and often forgotten. The cowards among them want to be pitied; the disillusioned, to be understood. And then, unable to live by acting in the present, they vacillate between the past and the future, between memory and expectation. They live by their hearts. And the heart—much used and overrefined—becomes more and more hungry.'

These words were written by a great moralist, as were these: 'Who knows if there cannot exist between certain human beings a fated understanding and a union so complete that it is far superior to what is generally known as love—brutal love, with its chances and its misunderstandings, its ease and its forgetfulness, its utilitarian selfishness, its need of promiscuity, its lack of infinity.'

How much there is to learn and to reflect upon in the beautiful chapters called 'Knowing How to Contemplate' and 'Death That Is Not Death.' But the most beautiful chapter of all is the one in which M. de Traz describes the moral condition of a patient called A., who undergoes the miraculous transformation of faith. The words that his biographer gives us are some of the most moving in all literature. All those who suffer should know them. They are the noblest example of self-conquest through cour-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

age and sacrifice. After his death, a friend of A.'s speaks to M. de Traz as follows:—

'I had told A. about the difficulties I had had in believing, and he had perhaps guessed some of the sorrows of my life. In his death agony he offered up his suffering to God and prayed that He might lead me to peace and truth. And that I might know that he was not forsaking me, he had this book given to me, the last one that was read to him, with a slip of paper on which he had written these words: "With the gift of my suffering to lead you toward the Light. Praised be pain; blessed be death."

'He loved me to the point of thinking of my salvation in the moment of his death. What other proof will ever have the same power for me as this last message of a dying man?'

To My Muse

By HERBERT PALMER

From *Summit and Chasm*, by Herbert Palmer. London: Dent. 1934.

LEAN over me now, Fafeenee,
For the Devil is standing by,
And the pantry door is open,
And it's filled with the blue fly.
Let the meat foul the blade, and the white haft turn gray,
We too shall be one forever when the world has passed away.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS AND THE ARTS

Twelfth Night in Moscow

Shakespeare's admirers, much more than his detractors, have condemned him to die in de-luxe editions and college classrooms. The text of the plays has been placed next to the Bible on the shelf of the untouchables; few producers, especially in this country, have dared to defy the taboo. Various attempts to revive Shakespeare have, of course, been made—notably the rather futile 'modernization' of a few years past, when several plays were produced in modern dress against futuristic settings. The Russians, however, unhampered by any Shakespearean tradition, have handled him very freely, and though they have made some appalling mistakes it has been in a good cause. Shakespeare is a box-office success in the U. S. S. R.

The latest play to appear in Russia is *Twelfth Night*, which was produced by the Moscow Art Theatre under the direction of S. V. Giatsintova and V. V. Gotovtsev. A lengthy critique by M. Zagorski in the *Literaturnaia Gazeta* describes a spectacle that would have shocked those of us who still remember *Twelfth Night* as a romantic comedy:—

'All the lyricism and amorous rigmarole with the disguise, the mistaken identity, and the serenading, taken by Shakespeare from the novelle of Bandello, have been made into a highly decorative background in the style of the Italian Renaissance. The rich comedy, on the other hand, the bright red-cheeked laughter of the clown, the serving wench, and the glutton Sir Toby, the pranks they play on Malvolio, the Rabelaisian humor that is so typical of the Elizabethan stage—all these play a leading rôle.

'Who is the Shakespeare we have here? In 1917 the Studio produced the play like a merry joke, and now the Moscow Art Theatre II, keeping the light tone of banter, has revealed the qualities that our own epoch loves best in Shakespeare—his loud mocking laughter at the narrowness and blindness of Puritan "virtue," his vigorous love of life, his sharp skepticism, and his blighting mockery of all the mainstays of feudal England—the Falstaffian fun that Marx and Engels prized so highly in his works.

'That is why the rascal Sir Toby and the servant Maria occupy such an important place. In them the salt of the play is concentrated. The directors have not only emphasized the cleverness of Maria and the fleshy vulgarity of the "fat knight" but also their intelligence, their love of jokes and merry pranks—that insatiable appetite for life that places Shakespeare with Rembrandt and the entire Flemish school. In this connection, we should like to advise the Moscow Art Theatre to endow Sir Toby with a good share of Falstaffian quips from the historical dramas with their magnificent echoes of the intelligent laughter of Rabelais and the deep irony of Montaigne. It would give the performance greater philosophical import without going against the wishes of Shakespeare himself, who duplicated in Sir Toby many of the characteristics of Sir John.'

We have here an excellent example of the breath-taking freedom of Soviet producers. Granting that Falstaff and Sir Toby belong to the same progression, what man brought up in the Anglo-Saxon tradition would dare lift passages from the Falstaff scenes in *Henry IV* and put them into the mouth of Sir Toby in *Twelfth Night?* Were a critic to make such a suggestion he would feel duty-bound to give reasons complex and irrefutable to prove that Shakespeare had actually intended to use some of the same lines in both plays. But the Soviet critic makes his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suggestion *en passant*, as casually as he might say, 'I think green curtains would be nice in Act II.'

'The Moscow Art Theatre has had a long series of able actors from Chekov to Kalini playing the rôle of Malvolio, but Azarin has created the part anew. With his gentle and fresh gift of comedy he has brought out traits that have remained hidden until now—Malvolio's ludicrous self-assurance that makes him such a cock-like fool, who sees no further than his nose but considers himself beautiful, wise, and terribly important. The artist has caught Shakespeare's scornful hatred of such thick-headed enemies of the art of living as this virtuous bourgeois who was laughed at more than once on the stage of the Globe. If Chekov in the rôle of Malvolio brought down the house with laughter, Azarin, losing none of the comedy, awakens in the spectator a feeling of scorn.'

How many of us would say that Shakespeare hated the character of Malvolio? Making him the prototype of the despised bourgeois is legitimate 'interpretation,' so long as it is called by its proper name, but to say that Shakespeare himself felt 'scornful hatred' toward Malvolio because he was a virtuous bourgeois is to sovietize the Stratford poet beyond recognition.

As for the lyrical part of the play, it has not only been relegated to serving as background but it has been changed to 'harmonize' with what is now the main plot—the story of Sir Toby, Aguecheek, Maria, Malvolio, and the Clown. In the performance of 1917 the part of Viola was played with all the delicacy of first love—and it was played seriously. 'But now,' M. Zagorski says, 'the actors have entered upon their task as experienced contemporaries, realizing where theatrical convention ends and real Shakespearean comedy begins.' The rôle of Viola is interpreted as expressing 'conventional theatrical feeling' and is therefore acted 'lightly—as a game, a smile, an ever-roving theme that pops up in the works of many poets. This interpretation of the romantic heroine gives the spectacle a sustained unity and forms a splendid contrast with the Falstaffian aspect of the play.'

In brief, the Soviet interpretation of *Twelfth Night* transforms it from a romantic comedy into a Rabelaisian farce—all of which will not surprise those who have read of the buccaneering Hamlet that has been presented to the Russian public. We may not approve of using Shakespeare for Communist purposes, but it is surely better to use him thus than to let him die the musty death that has been his lot on the American stage.

Casals on His Cello

WHILE Pablo Casals, the great Spanish violoncellist, was performing in Zürich, this essay of his, entitled 'My Instrument,' appeared in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*:—

'In one respect the violoncello resembles the beautiful women of our time—it has not grown older. On the contrary, it has grown younger with time and become more slender, more supple, and more graceful. Some thirty years have passed since the great composer regarded the violoncello as a solo instrument for which special works were written. Since then, however, it has changed and become smaller. It is easier to handle, and the bow has been made thinner.

'What has become of the individuality this instrument used to possess? Is it now the tenor in the orchestra, or does it play the rôle of baritone? The answer now depends on two things—the man who built the instrument and the man who plays it.

'My violoncello is a tenor. Other instruments have deeper, darker tones. A Stradivarius will always be different from the cellos made by any other master's hand. Nor should we forget that the individuality of the instrument bears

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the stamp of the artist who created it. I have often noticed that men who always play on one instrument gradually adjust themselves to it. When I hear an artist play, I can tell blindfolded whether he is playing a Stradivarius or another instrument of some familiar recognized type. I can also tell whether a good pianist ordinarily plays a Steinway or some other make. The more individual and valuable an instrument is, the more its character asserts itself through the man who plays it. On that account and because of our modern style of artistic presentation, I do not favor giving the individuality of the instrument too much scope. An instrument should not merely express itself but the truth, the composition that is being played upon it, and the artist must therefore master his instrument rather than be mastered by it. I am referring to the silent struggle between the artist and his own instrument.

'This leads me to reflect on the modern public and on the artistic performances of our day. Certainly the War and the infinitely disturbing consequences that have agitated mankind since then have changed the public. The modern audience is different from those that filled the concert halls before the War. But there is nothing bad about this, nothing unfavorable. Time, necessity, and the gigantic events in the world have merely deepened and widened the demands of the really artistically sensitive people. To-day the public demands great art from the concerts it attends. In this respect it has changed and is therefore eager for the works of Bach, Beethoven, and Mozart, and for the great moderns from Wagner to Ysaye. More than ever it demands great and worthwhile programmes. The time when trivialities were played in concerts is definitely over. Thus the performer finds himself in a different position. People play better and demand better things than they did before the War. The wild rushing stream of time has overwhelmed and swept away the epoch when concerts were given over to long and short technical artificialities, pieces that required diabolic finger work but never achieved deeper artistic values.

'Thus I return to my instrument. Certainly every artist brings his own individuality into what he plays, and if he does not subordinate himself to his instrument then his performance is his own creation. One needs only to think of purely physical demands in this connection—the length or shortness of the player's fingers, the reach of his arm, and the physical power that many compositions require. This simply means that artistic presentation has its own individuality. But this kind of individuality is poles apart from the individuality that specializes in the bizarre, in exploiting personal peculiarities, in the assertion of the performer's will for its own sake. Every individual creation of the artist must be directed toward the truth, and the public demands this truth to-day. The serious attitude of our period has done away with the artistic frills of the virtuosos, and in the artistic firmament the words "truth above everything" shine brightest. In recent years compositions for the violoncello have increased enormously. There is plenty of room for hard work in this field, and thus there is an opportunity for collaboration between the public, the period, and my own instrument as well.'

James Joyce at the Coupole

IT IS N'T only the Reichstag that holds 'historic' sessions. The other day, the *Amis de 1914*, a society of Parisian literati, gathered to pay tribute to James Joyce. Edouard Dujardin, the speaker-elect, assured all those present that they were witnesses to a 'historic' meeting. The friends of 1914 were happy and proud, but James Joyce, the guest of honor, received the compliment with cool Celtic disdain.

All this was taking place in the Coupole. Finally Daisy Fellowes arose. She had tried to interview James Joyce before

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speaking about him and had asked him to talk of himself. He had simply replied, 'It is not polite to talk about one's self.' But anyone who has been baptized in the spirits of the Coupole will not be so easily downed. Mrs. Fellowes discovered that the Irish writer had for a friend a British diplomat with leanings toward the art of painting—one Frank Budgen, who had written the minutes of their illustrious friendship with a meticulousness that would do honor to a recording secretary of the D. A. R. By a simple somersault of the imagination Daisy Fellowes became Frank Budgen and described all sorts of interesting adventures with the illustrious Dubliner.

'The scene is taking place in a Viennese cabaret in Germany. The gentlemen present (I am there, disguised as Mr. Budgen) are talking about literature. They mention their favorite authors. Mr. Joyce waxes impatient: "You have read much, but do you know of any author who presents a complete character in all its aspects?"

'Mr. Budgen suggests Goethe's Faust. But this is the answer he gets: "A complete man? Why, he's not a man at all. We don't even know whether he is an old man or a young one. Where does he live? Who are his family? And then another thing that proves that he is not complete is that he is never alone: Mephisto is always with him. We see him a lot, that's all. I am now working on a book that is a sort of *Odyssey*."

'"Is Ulysses your complete man?" asks Fellowes-Budgen.

'"Yes," Joyce replies. "Ulysses is the son of Laertes, but he is the father of Telemachus, the husband of Penelope, the lover of Calypso, the brother-in-arms of the Greek warriors at Troy, and King of Ithaca. He undergoes many trials and tribulations, over which he triumphs through his courage and wisdom. But he is not a hero. We must not forget that he is a defaulter who avoided compulsory military service by pretending to be insane. In all probability he would never have gone to Troy at all if some recruiting officer had not had the bright idea of stopping his ploughing by placing little Telemachus in the furrow in front of him. But once he came to Troy he changed completely; he wanted more and more of it—was it because they all lacked exercise inside the wooden horse? At any rate, he was not content to go back home at the end of the war, like any ordinary hero. He had developed a taste for adventure; he went on. This adventurer, moreover, was a perfect gentleman. When he emerged naked from the sea to meet the young princess, he modestly hid his vital parts with the clams and seaweed that stuck to his skin."

'"I am therefore writing a book based on the adventures of Ulysses, but the time is the present and only eighteen hours elapse. Every episode corresponds to an episode in the *Odyssey*. In my book the body lives and moves in space, but it is also the dwelling of a complete human being. I should like the reader to understand by suggestion rather than by a direct exposition of facts."'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SCIENCES AND SOCIETY

'SCIENCE AND WAR' is no longer a phrase to be argued with or disposed of by specious apologetics emanating mostly from liberals, pacifists, or well-trained diplomats. Readers of THE LIVING AGE during the past two or three years are exceptionally well qualified to know how intensive have been the activities, in all parts of the world, of that 'Secret International,' which, like Cadmus, can exist only by sowing the dragon's teeth of national hatreds. In his vivid sketch of Sir Basil Zaharoff, arms salesman extraordinary (published in the May, 1932, issue of THE LIVING AGE), Xavier de Hauteclocque coined the expression, 'Merchants of Death,' which has now become colloquial thanks to the very informative volume bearing that title by H. C. Engelbrecht and F. C. Hanighen (Dodd, Mead & Co). No one who desires a sober and, in the main, thoroughly dependable account of the munitions racket in all its subtle ramifications—political, economic, industrial, international, *and* scientific—can afford to neglect this book. If, upon finishing it, any reader still believes that war is a kind of spontaneous combustion of all the most evil and hopelessly ineradicable impulses of human beings—well, the death merchants will not hesitate to encourage a view so serviceable to themselves.

EVERYONE WHO has written seriously on armaments, munitions, and war making has occasion to be grateful to the English organization known as the Union of Democratic Control. Two years ago this group of energetic investigators published a pamphlet, the *Secret International*, generous abstracts of which have already appeared in these pages. It assembled, from every reliable source, enough information on 'Armament Firms at Work' to convince the most hardy idealist that there was assuredly something rotten in the state of Denmark. A year later, provided with a store of new facts, the Union issued *Patriotism, Ltd., an Exposure of the War Machine*. A very thorough exposure: so thorough, in fact, and so fully documented, that no satisfactory refutation of any of its statements has thus far been made.

SUCH REFUTATIONS, of course, have been attempted. One, by no less distinguished an authority than the world-famous British journal of science, *Nature*, takes issue with the pamphlet on the point with which we began: Science and War. Five months after *Patriotism, Ltd.* appeared, a leading editorial on 'Coördination of State Scientific Societies' (written presumably by Sir Richard Gregory) objected to certain facts brought out in the chapter entitled the 'Science of Murder'—or, rather, to certain interpretations of these facts. The Union of Democratic Control claimed that a generous amount of the funds allocated by the Government to such organizations as the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, the National Physical Laboratory, and the Medical Research Council were contributions 'to the research work for the more perfect murder of mankind.' Specifically, it was shown (often by direct quotation from official reports):—

'That a good deal of research required by the fighting services may be carried out by research associations themselves and so lead to real economy of effort and money';

That the Chemistry Research Board, under the supervision of experts from the fighting services, took over the direction of the Chemical Research Laboratory, which in turn, 'has been set up on our advice, not primarily in the interests of the chemical industry, but to carry out chemical research work in connection

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with government requirements and particularly to explore industrial problems of special interest to the national defense';

That, after consultation with the Admiralty, the War Office, and the Air Ministry, the Medical Research Council engaged in special researches to determine the relationship of good vision to shooting efficiency, the problems of vision in naval range finding, air bombing, and signaling;

That the Medical Research Council also gave of its time and efforts in collaborating with the Chemical Division on poison gases and the most effective safeguards against them.

And the point is made—in reply to the expected justification of science in the name of defense—that 'surely professional men, who claim to be disinterested scientists engaged in supposedly non-military research, have an overriding obligation to let the community that pays for their services know how its money is being spent.'

THE EDITOR of *Nature*, confronted (after five months) by these disturbing thoughts, offers the excuse that, after all, whatever science may discover in respect to war activities may prove equally, or more, vital in the interests of peace (the converse of this truism, however, seems not to have occurred to him); and that, moreover, specifically military researches form a very modest percentage of the activities of scientific bureaus subsidized by the Government. 'It has to be remembered,' he states, 'that scientific workers in government service can only enter a protest against policy by leaving the service.'

The above editorial had an interesting sequel. Shortly after its appearance the Union of Democratic Control began what was destined to be a long and tiresome correspondence with *Nature*, taking exception to its attitude and to its misleading interpretation of carefully checked material. For several weeks the courtesy of a printed 'reply' was withheld—surprising in a journal of science. Finally, in a letter signed by Miss Dorothy Woodman, secretary of the Union, *Nature* was challenged on three specific issues, and this letter was published in its April 21 issue. The points raised—with *Nature's* official stand regarding them—speak for themselves:—

(1) The Medical Research Council investigated a problem of direct importance to chemical warfare, namely, the limiting of the visual field for different types of respirators. This investigation was carried out at the request of the Chemical Defense Research Department *and the results were reported to that department only.* (All italics ours)

Reply. The only work done on the subject was undertaken by a member of the committee of the Royal Army Medical Corps, and, as he was giving whole-time service to the War Office, the Medical Research Council was not involved in any expenditure. (Query. Who paid the bill, arms makers or taxpayers?) Knowledge so gained is available for peacetime services.

(2) The Industrial Health Research Board investigated 'the personal factors in proficiency for naval gunnery.' Is it seriously maintained that this has an industrial application?

Reply. Certainly. This investigation 'formed part of a larger investigation into the general problem of vocational selection.' All the results will be available 'eventually, when enough evidence has been accumulated.' It would be interesting to work out some of the connections that so mysteriously link together 'industrial health,' 'vocational selection' (in a country with two million or more unemployed), and 'proficiency in naval gunnery.'

(3) The same board, at the request of the Admiralty, investigated the psychological factors in deep-sea diving and sent its reports to the Admiralty. In all these cases the investigations appear to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been financed by the Medical Research Council, yet the reports are not recorded as having been published.

Reply. This investigation had primarily to do with 'the fundamental question of the saturation of the tissues with gaseous nitrogen'—fundamental in the sense that nitrogen is always turning up in explosives and lethal chemicals? Reports have appeared in the *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Physiology*. (How many prospective 'deep-sea divers' are likely to see this highly technical magazine or understand what they find in it?)

After these remarkable apologetics *Nature* resumes its mantle of Olympian calm, thus closing an 'incident' that involves merely the life and security of a few millions in one small portion of a planet rushing head-on into war: 'We need scarcely say that no further space can be afforded *in these columns* for a discussion of the questions raised by the Union of Democratic Control as to the use made by the fighting services of civil research organizations.'

TURN NOW TO A document that is not so squeamish. In the *Air Menace and the Answer* (Macmillan) Elvira K. Fradkin has assembled so much material to prove the complicity of science in modern warfare as to make further doubt pure childishness.

To date—so far as is publicly known—chemical science has devised the following lethal gases, most of which either singly in varying strengths or in suitable combinations, ring every variation of suffering up to death in its most horrible forms:—

Lung irritants (suffocants): Phosgene, chlorine (first of the gases used by the Germans at Ypres), chloropicrin.

Sternutators (sneezers): Diphenylaminechlorarsine, diphenylchlorarsine (a few grains per cubic metre cause almost unbearable pain).

Lachrymators (tear gases): Brombenzylcyanide, chloracetophenone; bromobenzylcyanide, a new development, quickly and cheaply made, which induces steady weeping for seven days or more.

Vesicants (blisterers): Mustard gas, still the 'king of poison gases,' with ten distinct advantages in war time; lewisite, the American gas that has the smell of geraniums. A single drop on the skin causes agonies worse than the racks and screws of the Middle Ages.

Nerve poisoners: Hydrocyanic acid gas.

Blood poisoners: Arseniureted hydrogen, carbon monoxide.

Incendiaries: White phosphorus; thermite, which water or chemical extinguishers cause to act *more* violently; inflammable liquids, solid oils.

Other types include cacodyl isocyanide, a virulent affair one breath of which in full concentration would cause death; lead tetraethyl, used in 'anti-knock' gasoline; diethyl telluride, which can penetrate skin and in lesser concentrations may lead to chronic degeneration of the brain.

Analyzing the part played during the last war by poison gases—and that only for two and a half years—Miss Fradkin writes:—

'The total number of gas shells manufactured and used by the principal nations was approximately 58,000,000. This figure seems to be somewhere between five and ten per cent of the total artillery shell used by these nations. It is, therefore, essentially correct to state that all gas casualties were caused by about 17,000 gas troops and the artillery gas shells mentioned above. Thus, approximately 17,000 gas troops and between five and ten per cent of the total artillery shell caused well over one-half million of the casualties in the armies engaged . . . To-day, with well-organized gas divisions, another story could be told.'

General Amos A. Fries, head of the Chemical Warfare Service of the United States in France and co-author of a standard text on the subject, has declared:—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'In the past war more than twenty-seven out of every hundred Americans killed and wounded suffered from gas alone. You may say that many of the wounds were light. That is true, but those men were put out of the battle line for from one to four months,—divisions, corps, and armies almost broken up,—and yet the use of gas in that war was a child's game *compared to what it will be in the future*.' (Italics ours)

WITH REGARD to the coöperation between science and the fighting services of the different countries, these words from Miss Fradkin's well-documented volume put such statements as those in *Nature* in a far from honorable light:—

'The war poison gases,' she writes, 'are being tested in the major countries on animals with respiratory tracts similar to those of human beings, so that statistics of modern gas effectiveness are commensurable. "All nations to-day are strengthening their chemical arms and are conducting research continually, looking toward supremacy in chemical warfare," said General H. L. Gilchrist, chief of the Chemical Warfare Service of the United States. Supremacy in chemical warfare; the relentless competition between scientists of all nationalities, each in his laboratory, to develop more and more deadly gaseous effects; war as a branch of applied chemistry—that is the situation to-day, unemotionally stated.'

It is shown that the following nations have established chemical works, ready for war service on brief notice: Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Poland, United States, Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Greece, Rumania, Japan. As to how much of this 'peacetime' chemical activity is readily convertible into the service of Mars, we are given the following list of types of factories. 'To enumerate them all would be too alarming':—

All acid-producing factories: acetic, boric, citric, hydrochloric, hydrofluoric, nitric, phosphoric, sulphuric, tannic; all the alcohols: amyl, glycerine, methyl; methyl acetone, acetate of lime, ammonium, bleaching materials; the calciums: arsenate, carbide, chloride, phosphate; copper compounds, cyanides, formaldehyde, leads, magnesium, sodas, sulphides, and sulphites.

THOSE EXTREMISTS, pacifist or military, who adopt a shoulder-shrugging attitude toward what they term the 'alarmist' views of the nervous or the uninformed toward the horrors of chemical and mechanized warfare may also smile at the following quotation—but they are urged to read it carefully, nevertheless:—

'Poison-gas bombs spread deadly vapors that penetrate every mask and bring almost instant death, inextinguishable phosphorus bombs burn through the flesh to the bones in a few minutes. There are hundreds of tanks, each one of them able to spit out thousands of fatal shots per minute; machine guns, light automatic guns, which in the hands of millions of men can scatter hundreds of millions of bullets per minute. And, above all, this horror in the sky, darkened with thousands of airplanes, from which destruction pours on the earth. But that is not the whole picture: behind the lines, towns and villages fall in flaming ruin beneath shell fire from guns and airplanes.'

Beverly Nichols, you are tempted to say, 'crying havoc'; some liberal scholar or radical agitator attempting to frighten people into reason; a scientific romancer writing a sequel to Wells's *War in the Air;* or just some bright journalist 'observing' the European scene with an eye trained to see the worst and the most sensational? No, it is merely a prediction of what future war will be like, written in all seriousness and entire deliberateness by—Marshal Foch.

—HAROLD WARD

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

ANTOINE ZISCHKA'S article, 'Oil and War,' in our April issue has brought us this rejoinder by Mr. George A. Moreno, which explains itself. Mr. Moreno's quotations from M. Zischka are set in italics and quotation marks:—

'*Enormous oil deposits have been found there . . .*'

In 1913, I, a native American citizen, together with four Costa Rican gentlemen, prospected for oil in that country. We discovered seepages and other favorable indications. We filed our claims as discoverers in the 'Juzgado de lo Contencioso Administrativo' at San José, capital of Costa Rica. Under the provisions of the Mining Code we were awarded title to the petroleum resources in an area of about 500,000 acres. Three wells were drilled—number 1 to a depth of 1,008 feet, number 2 to a depth of 1,114 feet, and number 3 to a depth of 3,250 feet. All brought in small showings of oil and gas. Total production was about 50 barrels; average cost of drilling was approximately $250,000.00 per well. Drilling was suspended. These operations did not prove the existence of a commercial field. Cost of these operations was financed by Sinclair Oil interests. No other wells have been drilled in Costa Rica. The several oil concessions given by the Government of Costa Rica have lapsed because of non-development.

'*. . . and oil interests arranged revolutions to gain concessions.*'

My associates and myself, as discoverers, obtained our rights through legal court procedure. A native corporation, Compañía Nacional de Petróleo, obtained similar adjoining rights without recourse to revolution. In 1916 Leo J. Greulich, of Oklahoma, was legally given a concession by act of the Costa Rican Congress—the Pinto-Greulich concession. Later, other rights were granted, all through proper legal channels; none through revolutions. There has been no exception to this rule.

'*One day a certain Tinoco, head of a band of brigands, proclaimed himself president of the Republic.*'

Federico A. Tinoco was a cultured gentleman, scion of one of Central America's most distinguished and aristocratic families. He was educated in Europe and the United States. He was Minister of War when he made his coup and proclaimed himself president. The movement was a bloodless one. Since nearly one hundred years there has been no record of any band of brigands operating in Costa Rica.

'*Quite by chance he possessed magnificent arms provided by Vickers . . .*'

As Minister of War at the time he proclaimed himself president, Tinoco was in control of all government arms and armed forces. He did not need, nor did he receive, assistance from outside sources.

'*. . . and again, quite by chance, one of his first official acts was to give enormous concessions to Sir Henri Deterding's British oil fields.*'

Tinoco took over the government in February, 1917. The concession to British interests, Amory & Sons, was granted some time in 1918. The concession given in 1916 to Greulich, American interest, was respected. Negotiations with other American interests for additional concessions were opened by Tinoco. The Pinto-Greulich concession at that time was under active development by Sinclair Oil interests—the 'Costa Rica Oil Corporation.'

'*Standard Oil was in a rage.*'

Acting for my associates and myself, in 1916 I succeeded in arranging with Standard Oil interests to examine the Costa Rican field. A group of experts was sent there for the purpose. After their reports were received the Standard Oil lost all interest and withdrew.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1922 the Government of Costa Rica commissioned me to come to the United States to offer an oil concession, written in most liberal terms, to American oil interests. I offered the proposition to Standard Oil. It was rejected. My original credential to act for the Government is in my files at your disposal.

'*Washington lost patience. Another Costa Rican patriot was equipped with American guns and was given an ample supply of dollars and cartridges. President Tinoco was expelled.*'

President Woodrow Wilson refused to recognize Tinoco's Government. Costa Rica suffered keen economic depression. The Costa Rican, Lic. Julio Acosta, organized a revolutionary movement against Tinoco. He invaded Costa Rica from across the Nicaraguan border into Guanacaste Province. His forces numbered about 1,000 men, poorly armed, recruited principally from adventurous Central American mercenaries. Tinoco's forces met the rebels at El Jobo and defeated them. This practically ended the armed revolt.

On the eve of the 1918 congressional elections, President Wilson called on the American public to return a Democratic Congress. A Republican Congress was elected. Leaders of the Republican Party disapproved Mr. Wilson's non-recognition policy toward Tinoco. They now had the power to overrule President Wilson. Arrangements were made for a confidential agent to proceed to Costa Rica, investigate conditions there, and render a report that would justify a reversal of policy and still save Mr. Wilson's face before the public. I collaborated officially with said confidential agent.

Tinoco was informed of these steps. He prepared to meet us. A memorial addressed to our State Department, justifying the Tinoco Government and petitioning for prompt recognition, was circulated among Costa Rican government employees for their signatures. All male employees signed. The memorial then was presented to the teachers of the public schools, mostly young women. They refused to sign. Tinoco closed the schools, August, 1919. Three or four thousand schoolteachers and schoolchildren rioted in the Parque Morazán, San José. A troop of mounted police was ordered to disperse the mob. The young women and girls met the upraised sabers offering kissed roses to the men. The police sheathed their machetes and retired. The Tinoco Administration was held to ridicule. That night some one assassinated Joaquín Tinoco, Minister of War, brother of the President. Two days later the President fled to Paris.

'*The new government annulled the concessions granted to the English the day after its victory.*'

With the fall of Tinoco the old constitution, which he had replaced with a new one, was restored. Several months later elections were held, and a constitutional government was established. It annulled as unconstitutional all laws passed under Tinoco, including the concession to Amory & Sons. The Costa Rican Government, however, listened to the protests of the British Government. By a special treaty signed by both governments the validity of the Amory & Sons concession was submitted to arbitration, Chief Justice Taft of the American Supreme Court acting as arbitrator. This treaty was signed in 1920. Chief Justice Taft rendered his decision in 1922. He declared the Amory & Sons concession null and void, not because of illegality in the manner in which it had been given under Tinoco, but because the concessionnaires had failed to fulfill obligations required by the terms of the concession, thereby incurring the penalty of forfeiture. Great Britain accepted the sentence without objection.

'*Deterding's agents distributed enough money to convince the leaders of Panama that a war against the neighboring republic of Costa Rica was a national matter of first importance. This was in 1921.*'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Any student of Panamanian history and politics knows such action as claimed would be impossible unless aided and abetted by the Government of the United States.

The clash between Panama and Costa Rica, 1921, occurred without any outside instigation and was in no way connected with oil. It was a boundary dispute that had its commencement many years before Panama obtained its independence from Colombia. The dispute originated because of conflicting terms defining boundaries in the grants given by the King of Spain for what later became the Republics of Costa Rica and Colombia. The Governments of Colombia and Costa Rica submitted the question to King Alfonso XII of Spain for arbitration. He held the matter without action for over ten years and died leaving it unsettled.

Years later the controversy was submitted to President Loubet of France for arbitration. He fixed the boundary line from the Pacific coast to a point in the Andes, thereby awarding to Costa Rica an area that Colombia occupied without right. But, because of lack of geographic data, President Loubet was unable to fix the continuation of the line from the Andes to the Atlantic coast. This was the status of the dispute, and Colombia continued to occupy a certain area unduly, when Panama secured its independence and inherited the litigation. Then, in 1910 or 1912, for a third time the matter was submitted to arbitration, Chief Justice White of the American Supreme Court being appointed arbitrator. He gave his decision in 1918 or 1919. He confirmed the boundary line fixed by President Loubet from the Pacific coast to the Andes and condemned Panama to restore to Costa Rica the area unduly occupied in that zone. He also fixed the continuation of the boundary to the Atlantic coast, practically leaving it as it then was. He specified a date early in 1921 when Panama should turn over to Costa Rica the area belonging to it.

'*War was declared.*'

There has never been a declaration of war between Costa Rica and Panama.

'*A corps of Panama invaders crossed the frontier.*'

No such invasion ever took place.

'*The first day 430 men were killed. The next day, 732.*'

The total casualties were 26 men killed, lost by Costa Rica. The history of this action is as follows:—

In accord with the award given by Chief Justice White, early in 1921 Costa Rica sent a commission of eleven civilians to receive from the Panamanian authorities the area on the Pacific coast belonging to Costa Rica. There are no roads or other means of inland communication between the settled portions of Costa Rica and the awarded area. The commission had to travel several days by motor boat along the Pacific coast to the said area. On arrival its members were arrested by the Panamanians. After about two months, the Costa Rican Government, failing to receive any report from the commission and fearing it had suffered some mishap while en route, sent a relief expedition of twenty-six policemen and two officers. While navigating in an open motor boat up the Rio Coto, in the awarded area, the relief expedition was ambushed by Panamanian forces. There were only two survivors from this attack. Wounded, and after weeks of travel through the jungle, these two men reached San José and reported the occurrence. This was the only clash between the armed forces of the two countries that took place. The twenty-six men killed sums up the total casualties in combat.

'*Washington declared itself in favor of Costa Rica. It supported this declaration by informing the Government of Panama that the Canal Zone might be enlarged if hostilities did not cease.*'

Washington's action was limited to an appeal to both contending countries to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

avoid bloodshed. The threat claimed by Mr. Zischka to have been made to the Government of Panama is absurd to students of the politico-legal situation existing between the United States and Panama.

'*Washington supported this declaration by sending marines, munitions, and machine guns.*' (Commentator's note: Presumably to the Government of Costa Rica.)

Costa Rica received no such aid from the United States. As advisor to the General Staff of the Punitive Expedition sent by Costa Rica to invade Panama along the Atlantic coast, I had need to inspect the arms of the expedition. The rifles were mostly Mausers and Remingtons, averaging from ten to twenty years old, which had been in the hands of the Costa Rican Government all that time. The small-arms ammunition was about seven years old. Much of it would not explode. There were two machine guns of obsolete type and four old-fashioned Austrian mountain pieces with 600 rounds of ammunition that was eleven years old. The Costa Rican Punitive Expedition was not escorted by any marines, sailors, or soldiers of the American Navy or Army.

'*The Panama army was pursued, defeated, and annihilated.*'

The Costa Rican Punitive Expedition, about 2,000 strong, crossed the border, Atlantic Coast zone, at Guabito on the Sixaola River, entrained in a banana train operated by the United Fruit Company. The crossing of the international bridge was effected without opposition from the Panamanians. The troop train continued on the following day, passing through fifteen or twenty other Panamanian towns, stopping at each for refreshments and cheers, without ever meeting any opposition from Panamanian forces. That same evening the Costa Rican forces occupied Almirante, principal port on the Atlantic seaboard, again meeting no opposition for the simple reason that there was no Panamanian army there. The total casualties of this invasion were two of our men killed, when some one practised with one of our machine guns, and one man who shot himself through a leg accidentally while telling how great his appetite was for eating raw Panamanians.

The Costa Rican Punitive Expedition occupied Almirante during two days only. The Government of the United States then made representations to that of Costa Rica, suggesting it withdraw its armed forces from Panamanian territory in order to avoid bloodshed. Should the Costa Rican Government act accordingly, the Government of the United States pledged itself to support its cause in adjustment with the sentences passed by President Loubet and Chief Justice White in the arbitration of the boundary dispute. The Costa Rican Punitive Expedition evacuated Almirante on May 19, 1921, and sailed to Port Limon, Costa Rica, on United Fruit Company S. S. *Turrialba*. Some time in August of that same year the Costa Rican Government sent a second commission of civilians to the disputed area. The commission found the area unoccupied by Panamanian authorities and took formal possession of it. Costa Rica has held it peacefully since then. During the act of restoration the U. S. cruiser, *Pennsylvania*, steamed off the coast of the disputed area. This was as far as American forces intervened in the matter. Several years later diplomatic relations between Costa Rica and Panama were restored.

'*Costa Rica took a slice of territory from the Republic of Panama.*'

There was no such conquest. Costa Rica took only the area that rightfully belonged to it under sentences passed in arbitration.

'*America imposed arbitration. . . .*'

The history of the arbitration has been sketched above. It preceded the incidents of 1921 by many years, and America never imposed it. Mr. Zischka has his facts and dates mixed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WITH THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

THE Republican Senator Capper of Kansas, a member of our Advisory Council, does not agree with some members of the old guard that the New Deal is setting up socialism in the United States:—

'I look for a trend toward the conservative Right in administrative policies from now on, although not to the extent desired by New York stock exchange interests, for example. But there will be a decided moderation in attitude toward the regulation of industry and commerce as such, in my judgment.'

JAMES P. WARBURG, a member of our Advisory Council, whose recent book, *The Money Muddle*, takes Professors Warren and Pearson to task, has declared that the Roosevelt policies are drifting in two directions:—

'We have been drifting toward inflation —and have drifted so far that it may be difficult to turn back. On the other hand, we have drifted toward a regimented "planned economy," as expressed particularly in the administration of the N. R. A., the Agricultural Administration, such proposals as the Bankhead Bill, some of the implications of the Stock Exchange Bill, and in the general tendency of people to take their troubles to Washington instead of trying to solve them at home.'

ESTIMATING that American security holders control between 25 and 30 million votes, James W. Gerard of our Advisory Council urges them to form a national organization:—

'They can rank extremely high in political power by forming a national organization with central headquarters in Washington, with representatives above reproach who will advise them concerning legislation that affects their interests and will keep them advised as to how their political representatives are acting so far as those interests are concerned. They should be well and ably represented, and their representatives should be conspicuous and well known; their purpose, definitely stated, and their determination to protect the interests of the holders of securities throughout the nation, so plain that even politicians and Wall Street executives and directors may read.'

SUMNER WELLES, who served as American Ambassador to Cuba last summer at the height of the revolutionary disturbances and has now resumed his post as Assistant Secretary of State, has laid down a principle of American foreign policy that is at complete variance with former President Coolidge's notion that American capital enjoyed the protection of the American flag the world over:—

'American capital invested abroad should, in fact as well as in theory, be subordinate to the authority of the people where it is located,' said Mr. Welles, a member of our Advisory Council, and then justified Washington's refusal to recognize the Grau San Martin régime on these grounds:—

'The Grau San Martin régime not only lacked the support of, but was violently opposed by, every one of the groups that had opposed Machado and had fought to free Cuba from his tyranny, with the exception of a small percentage of the university students.

'To curry favor among the unthinking, the new government created an artificial anti-American campaign. As leaders of the administration cynically admitted, that was the easiest way to get support. But it was significant that at the same time secret agents of the Grau régime were striving desperately to reach an understanding with political lobbyists and representatives of the so-called big-business interests in the United States.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COLONEL THEODORE ROOSEVELT, a member of our Advisory Council, does not care much for his fifth cousin's alleged 'New Deal':—

'The so-called New Deal is not liberal and is not new. It is not liberal because it is confessedly an attempt to reduce the American people to a "regimented" group, submissive to the dictates of a small group or a single individual at the head of a vast bureaucracy.

'It is not new, but old as history, because practically without exception its policies have been tried in the past by other nations from the days of Rome and found wanting. It is reactionary and un-American because it carries as its logical conclusion some type of autocratic government. If it is fixed upon us, it predicates for the future an autocrat rather than a president.'

AMBASSADOR JESSE I. STRAUS, another member of our Advisory Council, has defined the alleged 'nationalism' of the present Administration as follows:—

'All corrective measures taken by the Administration at Washington are solely for the purpose of alleviating internal conditions. The accusation that radicalism is in power is entirely unjustified.

'The accusation that nationalism is running riot and that international repercussions would result and might, in fact, be intended to follow, is unjust. That some plans undertaken might conceivably result in harm to other nations may doubtless be considered as a possibility, but the first duty of the Administration is a regard for the stability of its own government and the comfort, health, and security of its own people.'

MAJOR GENERAL H. G. BISHOP, chief of Field Artillery in the U. S. Army, does not agree with the authorities cited by Mr. Ward in 'The Sciences and Society' who maintain that poison gas will be the decisive factor in the next war:—

'During the World War 12,000 tons of mustard gas were used, producing 350,000 casualties—or 30 casualties a ton. Of the 350,000, only 1½ per cent died. So it actually took more than two tons of gas to kill one man, leaving the lead bullet with its one dead man a ton far in the efficiency lead.'

What the General warns against is not gas but incendiary bombs:—

'The alarmist writers do not appear to have studied their subject very thoroughly, otherwise they would not have universally failed to mention the most powerful and most practical agency at the disposal of an airman for the destruction of a city—namely, thermite incendiary bombs. The simultaneous starting of a large number of fires, which can be accomplished by dropping these bombs on a great city, is more to be dreaded than gassing or high-explosive bombing.'

He concludes that the infantry will always be the decisive factor:—

'The great misconceptions with their attendant exaggerations, which envelop every invention or development in war machines, are engendered first by a natural human pleasure in shocking one's fellow man and by failure to realize the age-old fact that battles are won and war decided only by final physical contact of the belligerents or the fear of such contact. In other words, the decision is reached only by man meeting man with cold steel, or through a fear of such a meeting. The troops that go forth to effect physical collision are the infantry and the infantry's counterpart, the cavalry—men with rifle and bayonet, who close with their adversary and, after his overthrow, are capable of holding their gains.'

WE RECORD with regret the deaths of the following members of our Advisory Council: Dr. Peter Ainslie, Professor S. L. Galpin, Walker D. Hines, Otto H. Kahn, C. M. Lewis, Alwin J. Scheuer, and Major General George O. Squier.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COMING EVENTS

ARGENTINA

NATIONAL CELEBRATION. July 9, Independence Day.

AUSTRIA

SALZBURG. July 22, Automobile and Motorcycle Races; *28–September 2*, Salzburg Festival: Operas, Dramas, Concerts.

SEMMERING. July 14–15, International Golf Tournament; *August 26*, Bicycle Tournament.

VIENNA. June 15–July 31, Spring Art Exhibition; *June 16*, Golf Tournament; *16–17*, Road Races through the Austrian Alps for Automobiles and Motorcycles; *17, 24*, Spanish Riding School Performances; *22–29*, International Bicycle Race through Austria; *August 5, 12, 15, 19*, Horse Races.

BELGIUM

NAMUR. July 1–31, Annual Fair.

CANADA

NATIONAL CELEBRATION. July 1, Dominion Day.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

NATIONAL CELEBRATION. July 6, Anniversary of the Death of John Huss.

EGYPT

NATIONAL CELEBRATION. July 5, Birth of the Prophet.

ENGLAND

BATH. June 27, Archery; *July 4–5*, Rose Show; *8–14*, Rotary Carnival; *9–14*, Lawn Tennis Tournament; *16–21*, Summer Polo Tournament at Norton; *18–19*, Racing.

BEXHILL-ON-SEA. July 23–28, Horse Show; *August 18*, Regatta.

BLACKPOOL. August 1–7, Golf Tournament.

BOURNEMOUTH. June 27–28, Summer Flower Show; *August 6–11*, Bowls Tournament.

BRIGHTON. June 20–21, Sussex Agricultural Show.

BUXTON. June 20–23, 'Well-Dressing Ceremonies'; *August 13–18*, Lawn Tennis Tournament.

CHESTER. July 6, Carnival; *30*, Cheshire Agricultural Show.

CLOUTSHAM. August 1, Opening Meet of Devon and Somerset Staghounds.

COWES, ISLE OF WIGHT. August 4–11, Cowes and Royal Yacht Squadron Regattas.

IPSWICH. July 3–7, Royal Agricultural Show.

HARROGATE. August 6–7, Agricultural Show.

KESWICK. August 6, Keswick Sports.

LLANDUDNO. July 25–27, Royal Welsh Agricultural Show.

LONDON. June 15–August 6, Royal Academy of Art Exhibition; *15–16*, Lawn Tennis Wightman Cup at Wimbledon; *25–July 7*, Lawn Tennis Championships at Wimbledon; *July 9*, Croquet Championships at Roehampton; *9–11*, Cricket: Oxford *v.* Cambridge; *13–14*, Cricket: Eton *v.* Harrow at Lord's; *14*, Polo Cup Final at Roehampton; *16–18*, Dolmetsch Music Festival at Haslemere; *21*, Athletics: Oxford and Cambridge *v.* Princeton and Cornell at White City; *21, 23, 24*, Davis Cup Inter-Zone Final, Lawn Tennis Matches at Wimbledon; *30–August 4*, International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences; *August 9–11*, Athletics: Women's Olympiad at White City; *17–18*, Racing at Windsor; *18, 20, 21, 22*, Cricket: England *v.* Australia at the Oval; *31–September 1*, London Allotments and Gardens Show at New Horticultural Hall.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEATH. August 6–11, Welsh National Eisteddfod.
PETERBOROUGH. June 27, Foxhound Show.
RUNNYMEDE. June 15, Magna Carta Day.
STRATFORD-ON-AVON. June, July, August, Shakespeare Dramatic Season.
TIDWORTH. August 4, 7–11, Military Searchlight Tattoo.

France

NATIONAL CELEBRATIONS. July 14, Bastille Day; *August 15*, Assumption Day.
BORDEAUX. June 15–30, Annual Fair.
CONCARNEAU. August 19, Festival of the Blue Nets.
DEAUVILLE. August 26, Grand Prix.
FOURAS. August 5, International Fencing Tournament.
PARIS. June 17, Beginning of Great Fortnight: Horse Racing and Festivities; *July 28–30*, International Women's Congress Against War and Fascism.
SAINTES. August 1–15, Theatrical Performances in Roman Arenas.

Germany

BADEN-BADEN. July 21–22, Start and Finish of Long-distance Automobile Race; *August 26, 28, 31*, International Horse Races.
BAYREUTH. July 22–August 23, Wagner Festival; 'Genius at Work' Exhibition: Wagner Archives.
BERLIN. July 1–August 31, Flower Show.
BRESLAU. June 15–30, St. John's Festival.
COBURG. August 1–15, Historical Rifle Meeting.
COLOGNE. July–August, Exhibition of Mineral Wealth of the Homeland.
CREFELD-UERDINGEN. June 16–18, Handel Festival.
DANZIG. July 1–8, Gymnastic and Popular Festival.
DRESDEN. June 15–August 31, Exhibition: Architecture and Applied Art; *July 1–4*, Reunion of German Heavy Artillerymen.
DÜSSELDORF. June 15–July 31, National-Socialist Exhibition; *July 22–29*, Historical Rifle Meeting.
FURTH-IM-WALDE. August 12, Performance of Historical Local Play.
HAMBURG. July 14–15, International Rowing Regatta.
HAMELN. June 24–July 1, Pied-Piper Festival Week.
HEIDELBERG. July 15–August 15, National Festival Plays; *July 27–30*, German Pioneers' Congress.
KOLBERG. July 2, Frontier Province Demonstration.
LEIPZIG. August 26–30, Autumn Sample Fair.
MUNICH. July 9–August 20, Wagner and Mozart Festivals.
OBERAMMERGAU. June 17–20, 25, July 1, 4, 8, 11, 15, 18, 22, 25, 29, August 1, 5, 8, 12, 15, 19, 22, 26, 29, Jubilee Performances of the Passion Play.

Ireland

CAVAN. July 8, Gaelic Festival.
CURRAGH. July 25–26, Racing.
DONEGAL. June 15–August 15, Pilgrimage to Lough Derg.
KILLORGLIN. August 10–12, Puck Fair.
LIMERICK. August 24–25, Horse Show.

Scotland

AYR. June 16–23, Historical Pageant of Ayrshire.
CRIEFF. August 18, Highland Gathering.
IRVINE. August 25, Crowning of Marymass Queen.
ST. ANDREWS. August 13, Golf Tournament; *14*, Lammas Fair; *20*, Scottish Hard-Court Tennis Championships.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GUIDE POST
(*Continued*)

one of the leading pamphleteers of the Third International. Our own conclusion is that Trotski has shot his bolt as far as revolutionary activity is concerned. For him to lead a successful world revolution to-day would be like Napoleon returning from Saint Helena and becoming emperor all over again: history does not usually offer the same man two chances to play a great rôle. But the effectiveness of Trotski's brain and pen will continue as long as there is life in his body.

OUR three items from England might all be considered humorous, especially the brief account of the last Vickers meeting, written by a stockholder who attended the party. But when we remember that the same Vickers that sold munitions to Turkey before 1914 and thus helped to kill British troops at Gallipoli is to-day arming Germany with the connivance of the British Government, the episode ceases to be a joke.

INTERNAL evidence suggests that the same contributor to the *Economist* who described Baron Münchhausen's visit to 'Autarkistan' in our March issue is also responsible for the prophecy that the Jewish problem and the problem of overproduction will be solved by putting the Jewish race to sea aboard the idle merchant vessels and letting them consume the world's surplus productions on a permanent world cruise.

JAN STRUTHER, one of the rising young British essayists, maintains the tradition of Charles Lamb with a sardonic sketch of one of our best people, a type, incidentally, that is not confined to the British Isles.

VASSILI GROSSMAN'S story, 'The Soldier Mother,' introduces the first published work of a new Soviet writer. The action occurs during the Polish invasion of Russia before the Bolshevists, who routed and pursued the enemy into Poland, had been repulsed by General Weygand's troops at the gates of Warsaw in 1920 in what Lord d'Abernon has called one of the decisive battles in world history. We hereby warn any of our readers with delicate sensibilities that the physical processes of childbirth are described with relish and in some detail.

HAROLD LASKI'S sketch of young Pundit Nehru, several of whose articles have been reproduced in our pages, reminds us that the Indian problem continues to agitate British politics and that the Indians themselves are more determined than ever to gain their independence.

CHARLIE CHAPLIN, once the idol of the radicals, is taken to task by a Mexican Communist for having failed in his more recent work to emphasize the protests against capitalism, which, we are assured, explain the popularity of his pictures of ten and twenty years ago.

ONE item in our 'Books Abroad' department deserves special mention—the *New Statesman and Nation's* review of Ernst Henri's book, *Hitler over Europe*. Our readers are already familiar with Mr. Henri's thesis as set forth in his article reprinted from the *Week-end Review* in our October, 1933, issue. He regards the whole Nazi movement as the creation, pure and simple, of one group of German industrialists who are trying just as hard to drive Germany to war as the French heavy industries are trying to drive their country in the same direction. Between the two of them it looks as if they might succeed, especially with such fertile territory as the Saar to exploit.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED